UNIVERSITY OF LONDON THESIS

Degree PhD Year 2006 Name of Author YOUNGER David Barkin

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DYADIC REFLECTIVE FUNCTIONING QUESTIONNAIRE (DRFQ)

DAVID BATKIN YOUNGER

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University College London

2006

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

I, David Younger, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

Signed

Abstract

This thesis describes the construction of an attachment and psychoanalytic theory inspired self-report measure to assess the quality of mutual awareness of mental states in couples (dyadic reflective function). The Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire (DRFQ) has its theoretical foundation in the Reflective Functioning Coding Manual developed by Fonagy and his colleagues (1997). The DRFQ was constructed to assess the ability to think about oneself and one's partner in situations of discord that involve the triggering of the attachment system. The measure includes testing first, second and third order theory of mind in relation to both epistemic and emotional mind states in relation to one's partner in the context of a heated argument. Several indicators of accuracy of mind-reading were developed based on the strength of association between self-report of one member of the dyad and the estimation of the other member controlling for self-report of that member. Second order theory of mind was assessed by asking subjects to anticipate what their partner was likely to have reported about them. Third order theory of mind was estimated asking participants to estimate their partners' estimations of their estimations of their partners.

The first study reported employed 20 heterosexual couples and demonstrated that as predicted an inverse relationship existed between the quality of dyadic reflective functioning on the DRFQ and attachment style anxiety and avoidance on the revised Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (Fraley, Brennan, & Waller, 2000). Following the pilot study, test-retest reliability of the instrument was assessed with a further random sample of 20 couples.

The validation of the measure was undertaken with participant couples drawn from the general population and a sub-sample of couples that were undergoing psychodynamic couple therapy. Following the pilot study, and a refinement of the measure, a larger study was conducted (n=96 couples). The DRFQ was administered alongside a battery of self-report measures to assess both discriminant and concurrent validity. Results demonstrated strong negative correlations between dyadic reflective functioning scores and interpersonal problems on the Inventory-Circumplex (Alden, Wiggins, & Pincus, 1990) and the general severity index (GSI) of the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983).

Predictive validity of the instrument was assessed in a further investigation using the DRFQ to predict the quality of the couple's relationship as reflected by the Abbreviated Dyadic Adjustment Scale (ADAS) (Sharpley & Rogers, 1984) one year after the administration of the reflective functioning instrument.

A final qualitative study with a small sample of couples (n=5) that were in therapy was also conducted in order to explore more in-depth connections between high and low scores in dyadic reflective functioning using the DRFQ and the experience of couple fit and functioning.

It is hoped that an exploration of the processes of reflective functioning in couples will lead to further understanding of attachment processes in couples and to more clarity of focus in assessing process and outcome in couple therapy.

Key Words: Attachment theory, Reflective Functioning, Dyadic Reflective Functioning

Table of Contents

Appendices

List of Figures and Tables

Acknowledgements

There are a handful of people that I want to thank and pay tribute to who have played essential roles in the completion of this thesis. Without you this would not have been possible.

Mi amor, no hay nada que pueda decir que aún no sepas. Hemos vivido veinte años en los últimos cuatro. Hemos vivido en tres continentes. Nos hemos casado y tuvimos a nuestro Ericsito. Ustedes son mi inspiración cada día. Todo lo que hago es para ustedes.

Mom and dad, you have been so incredibly supportive, giving and encouraging. You have been more of a support for me than you will ever know. You are always there, and have been my secure base from which to explore.

PaPa, I will never forget the day we went for lunch when I told you that I was going to leave Universal to do a masters degree in psychology. It meant that the family business would no longer stay with the family. It meant that we wouldn't be working together and that I would not be following in your footsteps. It meant taking risks and investing a tremendous amount of time and money into furthering my education and experience. You never once tried to dissuade me. You never once doubted me. You just encouraged me to fly.

When I applied to do this PhD, I did not even know what I wanted to focus on. The only thing I knew was that I wanted to work with Peter Fonagy. Peter, you took me on with this uncertainty and when I told you that I wanted to create my own project and how important it was for me to do so, you gave me all of the time and space that I needed. For almost 3 years we met practically every week. You are the single busiest man I have ever known, but I can count on one hand the amount of times that you cancelled one of our meetings. You never spoon-fed me, but you seemed to always know when I needed a push and how hard. I have learned so much from you and from this experience. Thank you for everything.

Trudy, if it wasn't for you, I would never have contacted Peter to talk with him about doing this. I wouldn't have done my training. Who knows what else? You were the keystone to my London Bridge.

I want to thank Gillian Walton and John Goodchild, my training director and clinical supervisor at Relationship Counselling for London. You were always so supportive of me and my efforts, willing to do whatever it took to help me without asking for anything in return.

The IPA RTP 2005 was a great learning experience. I want to thank my friends and colleagues from the program and especially my mentors, Bob Emde and Bob Waldinger.

Finally, I have written the vast majority of this thesis in various Starbucks all over the world: Hampstead Heath, Belsize Park, Hampstead, Golders Green (London), Stamford, Mt. Kisco, New Canaan, Riverside, various Manhattan locations (New York and Connecticut), and in Lima, Peru. You've been my international hub and your green tea has fuelled me through.

CHAPTER 1. REVIEW OF RESEARCH IN DYADIC ATTACHMENT, COUPLE CONFLICT, EMPATHIC ACCURACY AND REFLECTIVE FUNCTION

1.1 Introduction

John, 42, and Mary, 39[1], have come for a joint therapy consultation. They have one child, Patrick, aged 3. They say that the problems started after Patrick was born. Before they had him, everything was going really well. They have similar interests and a lot of friends in common. They used to go on cycling weekends every month. They had been together for twelve years before deciding to have children. It was something that they both wanted, but that they were both implicitly wary of. Neither John nor Mary wanted to be the one to express their doubts about having a child, but both worried it was going to change their relationship drastically and, sure enough, it did.

When Mary was pregnant with Patrick, they were excited and eager for things to work out well. They filled their bookshelves with books on pregnancy and caring for newborns. They always went together to their Lamaze classes. They created a shared illusion that the honeymoon was going to continue unabated no matter what. Patrick's birth was like an atomic explosion. John remembers vividly the physical sensation when the nurse placed Patrick in Mary's arms. Mary locked eyes with Patrick and John felt the earth crumbling from beneath his feet. His baby looked like an alien to him and the reality of the change suddenly pierced every cell of his body. John said he never felt more alone in his life.

Mary was consumed by Patrick. She was in love from the moment he was placed in her arms. The maternal preoccupation was intense and all-encompassing.

[1] Names, ages and other information was changed to maintain anonymity

She had absolutely no idea how John was feeling and admits that even if he told her, she wouldn't have had the space to take it on board.

Things deteriorated progressively from then on. John felt completely unable to connect with the baby, especially if Mary was around. He felt consistently excluded and persecuted by the new union between Mary and Patrick. Though the feelings were palpable, neither spoke about what was going on. Patrick felt that he would have looked foolish and selfish and needy and Mary thought that John was repulsed by her. She became increasingly obsessed with her weight and her inability to regain her former figure and was convinced that John was having an affair.

Eventually John did have an affair with his secretary at work. He started going home late at night and there were nights when he didn't return home at all. Mary found out about the affair one morning when John had forgotten to sign out of his email. She succumbed to the temptation to open it and found a letter from June, John's secretary, telling him how amazing their encounter was the night before.

Mary flew into a hysterical rage and took all of John's things and threw them out of the house onto the street. He moved in with his brother where he was living for six months prior to coming to therapy. John and Mary didn't talk for the first three months. He didn't see Patrick either. They slowly started communicating again and John assured Mary that his relationship with June had ended. They jointly decided to go to couple therapy to try to understand why things collapsed so explosively.

John and Mary are an example of one type of couple that will be discussed in the following chapters: a fused couple that thrives on their shared feelings of oneness. They barely argued and they almost always wanted to participate in the same activities. They both had strong unconscious concerns that a third would destroy their relationship, and the prophecy was realized. The most striking example of this

change was how completely unable they both were to comprehend and reflect on what the other was experiencing when John was feeling so isolated and alone and when Mary was feeling so unattractive and paranoid. Even though it was completely obvious to both of them that things were seriously wrong, they were both so overcome by their own experiences that neither was able to even glimpse each other's.

The ability to put oneself into someone else's shoes and to reflect on one's own feelings and on those of a significant other are the ingredients that define the concept of dyadic reflective functioning, a concept that is introduced in the present thesis as a theoretical offshoot of the concept of reflective function, developed by Fonagy and his colleagues (1997) as the most important predictor of attachment security in adults.

In what follows, a brief explication of attachment theory and attachment and object-relations theory in couples is followed by a more elaborate review of research that has been conducted on conflict and couple relationships. The relationship between attachment style and conflict in couples is then followed by a theoretical and empirical review of the social psychological concept of empathic accuracy. The concept of reflective function is introduced and its theoretical function elucidated, as well as its roots and relation to attachment security and couple relationships. This includes identifying a developmental trajectory for reflective function, which has critical importance and meaning with respect to working therapeutically with adult romantic relationships.

Empirical support for the relevance of reflective capacities is demonstrated, as well as the development of the Reflective Function Scale (Fonagy, Steele, Steele, & Target, 1998), which is used in conjunction with the Adult Attachment Interview

(AAI) (George, Kaplan, & Main, 1985) concerning caregiver-child relationships. Other applications of reflective function are also reviewed, demonstrating both the dearth of research on reflective function in couple psychotherapy, and the overwhelming need for its undertaking.

Reflective function in the couple relationship is discussed concerning its relevance and clinical utility. A measure is ultimately proposed to address reflective function in couple relationships called the Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire (DRFQ). The construction of the measure is elaborated, along with its refinement and application in a pilot study with couples from the general population (n = 20 couples). Test-retest reliability of the measure is assessed. This is followed by a larger study including a sub-sample of couples in couple therapy (n = 96 couples). A study of predictive validity is conducted followed by a qualitative analysis of what couples in therapy look like who have different scores on the DRFQ.

1.2 Attachment Review

Attachment theory has its roots in psychoanalysis, and shares common ground with cognitive psychology in the rejection of drive theory and a move towards a more empirical discipline. Attachment theory, as defined by Bowlby in a lecture on *The making and breaking of affectional bonds* (1979), "is a way of conceptualizing the propensity of human beings to make strong affectional bonds to particular others and of explaining the many forms of emotional distress and personality disturbance...to which unwilling separation and loss give rise" (127). In attachment theory, much of what is considered to be pathological is proposed to be directly connected to faults in the development of the attachment system.

Bowlby argued that attachment behaviour is necessary for survival, and that the nature of the mother-infant relationship is crucial in creating a secure base for the child, which persists as the basis for his/her interaction with the environment for the rest of his/her life. He stated that the key point of his thesis is that there is a strong causal relationship between an individual's experiences with his parents and his later capacity to make affectional bonds (Bowlby, 1979).

Different types or classifications of attachment behaviour can be identified based on the ability of the child to explore his/her environment and how he/she uses his/her primary caregiver as a secure base from which to explore and return. Intertwined with this, and equally important, is the way in which the child reacts to separation from the primary caregiver. These classifications have been extended to adult relationships and will be elaborated on in further sections.

1.2.1 Internal working models

Internal working models (IWMs) are constructed based on patterns of interaction with main attachment figures over time. IWMs serve to "regulate, interpret, and predict both the attachment figure's and the self's attachment-related behaviour, thoughts, and feelings" (Fonagy, 1999, p. 89). Craik (1943) conceived of the ability to form complex IWMs as an evolutionary advantage because this ability to predict and evaluate makes for much more flexible and adaptive behaviour. Craik's emphasis on the evolutionary utility of the advantage of predictability that comes from the development of complex IWMs coincides with Bowlby's (1969/1982) claim that to be of use in new situations, IWMs had to have the range and capacity to incorporate both potential and experienced realities. Even though a huge emphasis was placed on the IWM with respect to main attachment figures, this theorizing implies and incorporates a much more general self-other pattern of interactions. "It

applies to *all* representations and is not restricted to working models of self and other in attachment relationships" (Fonagy, 1999, p. 91).

The quality of the representation one has of one's self, according to Bowlby, will depend upon the relationship between the child and his/her main attachment figure(s). A positive model of self is intrinsically bound to, and dependent on, a model of one's parents as emotionally available. The converse also applies, that a negative model of self will be intrinsically bound with a model of parents as rejecting or ignoring of attachment behaviour and/or interfering with exploration (Craik, 1943).

It is important to emphasize that the relevance of attachment behaviour transcends infancy and childhood. Attachment behaviour and attachment relationships will inevitably change over time. Representations of self and other will, and should change over time as well. Bowlby repeatedly warned of the pathogenic potential of working models that are *not* updated (Fonagy, 1999). On the other hand, internal working models are not meant to change fundamentally with every experience, interaction and thought. There must be a certain degree of resistance to change that is built in that allows for a stability of the representations. This, at least allows for the illusion of omnipotence and confidence in predicting responses from others and from the environment. This resistance to change can be a healthy manifestation, just as it can lead to more pathogenic defensive operating where one's representation of reality is substantially skewed by the inability to assimilate new material. A certain degree of resistance to change can be quite helpful in the sense that it can protect one from being extremely susceptible to fluctuations in the behaviour of others: "Therefore an attachment figure's occasional lapses in sensitivity are not likely to undermine a child's confidence in the figure's emotional availability" (92).

The primary aim in the defensive exclusion of material is the protection of the individual by the individual from experiencing something that has been experienced as, or that might be perceived of as harmful in some way. Although defensive exclusion is a means of protecting the individual in the present, "Bowlby warned that it may subsequently interfere with the adequate updating of working models" (Fonagy, 1999, p. 93). This type of defensive exclusion was posited by Bowlby to have possibly been facilitated by the separation of contradictory material into different models. Bowlby claimed that two types of situations are especially likely to cause defensive exclusion: "(1) when a child's attachment behaviour is intensely aroused, but is not assuaged and is perhaps even punished or ridiculed by a parent; and (2) when a child has come to know something about the parent that the parent does not 'wish him to know about and would punish him for accepting as true'" (Bowlby, 1980, p. 73).

As a result of defensive exclusion, as alluded to earlier, a child may come to develop and operate with two or more incompatible sets of internal working models that were developed on the basis of the segregation of incompatible information. One of the models might be the consciously accessible information that was essentially allowed to pass through the filter, and another "consciously inaccessible set, reflecting the child's experience/interpretation of the situation at the time" (Fonagy, 1999, p. 94). It is interesting to note that Bowlby did not relegate the inaccessible information to the Unconscious. In other words, defensively excluded information was not posited by Bowlby to have been defensively repressed by the Ego to the Unconscious, rather it was consciously placed in another category or place in order to avoid conflict. Attention is then diverted from the unwanted material, which can lead to individuals diverting attention from their own attachment needs (Fonagy, 1999).

Bowlby believed that internal working models could be communicated between people and transmitted from one generation to another via nonverbal and verbal communication patterns (Fonagy, 1999). An integral way that a parent can create a secure base for their child is to have the ability to not just support their exploration of the outer world, but also by facilitating their exploration of their inner worlds by "engaging in verbal dialogue *about* working models" (94).

To sum up, the interplay of internal working models is a highly complex process that exists on many different levels of recollection capacity. Attachment interactions and attachment conversations both contribute to the construction of internal working models of self and other. The availability of the primary attachment figure(s) to receive the emotional information of the infant is crucial in the construction of the representation that the infant has of him/herself. Working models can operate defensively based on exclusion of information, but they also operate to create and stabilize meaning for the individual. Due to the fact that working models are created based on the individual's interaction with his/her primary attachment figures and his/her environment, the nature of internal working models is quite subjective, "in that they represent reality from the perspective of a particular individual with his or her specific history of meaning or attribution making" (Fonagy, 1999, p. 99).

1.3 Differences between couple and individual attachment

Bowlby (1979) postulated that attachment is not just a phase that children go through in the beginning of life; rather, it is something that persists throughout childhood, adolescence and adulthood, with obvious changes in behaviour and choices of attachment figures. Adult and romantic attachment is qualitatively quite distinct from childhood attachment in several important ways: attachment between adults can be generalized as being a reciprocal attachment concerning needs, emotions, expectations, etc., also, there is a sexual element in adult attachment that most would argue does not exist in childhood attachment. Adult attachment is built on the foundation of former attachment relationships. It is imbued with a past that manifests itself both consciously and unconsciously in the dynamic working models that influence motives, decisions, attractions, etc. in romantic relationships.

There is a prominent point of distinction between couple attachment and caregiver attachment in that in couple attachment, each partner acts as the attachment figure for the other. It is a bidirectional, versus a unidirectional attachment relationship. One of the defining features of secure couple attachment is that both partners are able to be in the "dependent" and the "depended-upon" positions respectively. This so-called bi-directionality comes with a corresponding empathic appreciation of the partner's thoughts and feelings in both these positions (Fisher & Crandell, 2001). This implies flexibility in a behavioural sense, as alluded to earlier with respect to being in both the "dependent" and "depended-upon" positions. It also implies a more intangible sense of flexibility that pertains to the ability to appreciate one's partner's thoughts and emotions.

Insecure couple attachment is conversely defined by inflexibility in moving from the "dependent" to the "depended-upon" position. The insecurely attached

couple dynamic is much more rigid, and will often be marked by one person being stuck in one position and the partner being stuck in the other position. Partners will show little awareness of the nature of the other's experiences on either the self or the other (Fisher & Crandell, 2001). There are different sub-types of insecurely attached relationships, but they are universally characterized by this inflexible behaviour and mental awareness of the other.

1.4 Conflict in couples

Research on conflict in marriage has received a tremendous amount of attention in marital research because conflict has always been quite obviously associated with marital satisfaction or distress. Koerner & Jacobson (1994) stated that distress results from couples' aversive and ineffectual response to conflict. There have been studies related to conflict and mental health; conflict and physical health; conflict and the family; conflict and cognitions; and, conflict and behaviour, all of which will be reviewed briefly in this section. In many of these studies, associations are demonstrated between conflict and marital satisfaction, or, conflict and drinking, for example, which are relevant and worthwhile, yet simultaneously lacking a developmental framework, which is part of the purpose of the present study in investigating dyadic reflective function in situations of disagreement where the attachment system is activated. Following a review of the aforementioned conflict-related studies, studies in conflict-related attachment research will be discussed.

1.4.1 Conflict & Mental Health

The impact that marital conflict has on general well-being and mental health has been demonstrated in a number of studies (Coyne & Downey, 1991; O'Leary & Smith, 1991). A connection has been made between depression and marital conflict

(Beach, Fincham, & Katz, 1998). A connection with eating disorders has also been demonstrated (Van den Broucke, Vandereycken, & Norre, 1997). Associations have also been shown with respect to emotional and physical abuse in relationships (O'Leary, Malone, & Tyree, 1994), male alcoholism (O'Farrell, Choquette, & Birchler, 1991), and other drinking-related issues (Murphy & O'Farrell, 1994) and a number of reviews have been conducted on marital functioning and psychopathology (Davila & Bradbury, 1998; Halford & Bouma, 1997).

1.4.2 Conflict & Physical Health

Marital conflict has been shown to be associated with general poor health in a number of studies (Burman & Margolin, 1992; Kiecolt-Glaser, Kennedy, Malkoff, Fisher, & Speicher, 1988), and with specific illnesses including cancer, cardiac disease and chronic pain (Schmaling & Sher, 1997). In further studies, the attempt has been made to explain the mechanisms underlying the links between marital conflict and poor physical health, demonstrating that conflict behaviour is related to immunological (Kiecolt-Glaser, Glaser, Cacioppo, MacCullum, & Snydersmith, 1997; Kiecolt-Glaser, Malarkey, Chee, Newton, & Cacioppo, 1993), endocrine (Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 1997; Malarkey, Kiecolt-Glaser, Pearl, & Glaser, 1994), and cardiovascular (Ewart, Taylor, Kraemer, & Agras, 1991) functioning.

In a number of studies, marital conflict has been shown to have more of an impact on the physical health of wives than husbands (Gottman & Levinson, 1992; Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 1997; Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 1993; Kiecolt-Glaser, Newton, Cacioppo, MacCullum, & Glaser, 1996; Malarkey et al., 1994). Fincham & Beach (1999) assert that "marital conflict has been linked to several facets of health and remains a vital area of research" (Fincham & Beach, 1999).

1.4.3 Conflict & The Family

Marital conflict has been found to be associated with critical family outcomes including poorer parenting (Erel & Burman, 1995), poorer child adjustment (Grych & Fincham, 1990), problematic attachment to parents (Owen & Cox, 1997), more parent-child conflict (Margolin, Christensen, & John, 1996) and conflict between siblings (Brody, Stoneman, & McCoy, 1994). These and other studies have led to an increased emphasis being placed on the impact of conflict in a systemic perspective (Cox & Paley, 1997; Fincham, 1998).

1.4.4 Behavioural & Cognitive Manifestations of Marital Conflict

The primary role that conflict has been demonstrated to play in marital satisfaction and with respect to correlates such as mental and physical health and the family relationship, all discussed earlier, has led to further research into the behaviour and cognitions that are involved in marital conflict. The following is a brief review of work that has been conducted concerning observable patterns of marital conflict, followed in the next sub-section by a brief review of cognition and marital conflict.

1.4.4.1 Behavioural Patterns

O'Leary & Smith (1991), in a study of problem-solving interactions in couples, found that distressed couples emit more negative statements and fewer positive statements and show greater reciprocation of negative behaviours during problem-solving interactions (Fincham & Beach, 1999). Indeed, this "negative affective reciprocity" was found to be more consistent across different types of situations than the amount of positive or negative affect (Gottman, 1979). Negative behaviour during conflict has been found to be associated with marital distress, and even more so when negative behaviour is physical in nature (Burman, John, & Margolin, 1992; Gottman, 1994). When a couple is entrenched in a negative

interaction, the most difficult, yet the most beneficial thing to be able to do is to repair the interaction...e.g. metacommunication (Fincham & Beach, 1999). This is something that is much easier to do for non-distressed couples, who are more capable of listening and reflecting, and whose interactions appear more random and unpredictable (Weiss & Heyman, 1997).

Studies of disagreement and interactions across situations have demonstrated that coping and behavioural patterns tend to be relatively consistent (Stone & Neale, 1984). Conflict behaviour has also been demonstrated to be consistent over time (Gottman, 1994; Weiss & Heyman, 1997). Fincham and Beach (1999) emphasize the important consideration that conflict is an all-encompassing term. Different conflict situations have different qualities and intensities, and it is important to take into account the specific situation and the meaning that it has for a specific couple: "Some types of problems may be associated with both poorer marital outcomes as well as poorer problem-solving behaviour, leading to spurious conclusions if problem-solving behaviour is examined in isolation" (51). From a psychodynamic point of view, one would never want to look at behaviour alone in assessing conflict. It should always be considered with respect to the unconscious contract of the couple and the unconscious mechanisms that influence and are influenced by behavioural manifestations.

1.4.4.2 Cognitive Patterns

Studies have demonstrated important links between conflict-behaviour and conflict-related cognitions. According to Fincham & Beach (1999), there is increasing evidence that explanations or attributions for negative marital events can increase the probability of conflict behaviour. These cognitions or attributions have been shown to be related to problem-solving behaviours and specific affects

demonstrated during these behaviours (Bradbury & Fincham, 1992). As with studies that exclusively view behaviour, studies that view cognitions without taking into account unconscious processes, are neglecting such critical components of couple relations such as unconscious fit, projective identification and oedipal issues that give rise to reflective space.

1.5 Attachment style & Conflict in couples

A considerable amount of work has been conducted examining the relationship between attachment-style and problem-solving, or conflict-resolution cognitions, attitudes and behaviour (Bouthillier, Julien, Dube, Belanger, & Hamelin, 2002; Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000; Creasey, 2002; Creasey & Hesson-McInnis, 2001; Fishtein, Pietromonaco, & Barrett, 1999; Fitzpatrick, Fey, Segrin, & Schiff, 1993; Gaines et al., 1997; Gallo & Smith, 2001; McGonagle, Kessler, & Schilling, 1992; Pistole, 1989; Rholes, Simpson, & Grich, 1998; Shi, 2003; Simpson, Rholes, & Phillips, 1996). A review of these studies reveals the consistent association between secure attachment style and positive conflict-resolving attitudes and behaviour, and conversely, an inverse association between insecure attachment styles and positive conflict-resolving attitudes and behaviour. It also elucidates the somewhat arbitrary and subjective manner in which past authors have approached the activation of the attachment system in order to assess attachment representations and/or behaviour. This is an important point to consider, because if one is being asked to reflect on his/her past attachment behaviour using self-report, one would expect qualitatively different responses than if the attachment system is activated during the investigation, and the subject is actually responding based on a current/in-the-moment experience of threat or loss.

In the present study, couples were asked to think about and respond to the biggest issue of disagreement in their relationships, which was not only meant to focus the couple on a specific situation in a specific time and place, but it was also meant to activate the attachment system.

Kobak & Sceery (1988) found that individuals with secure attachment style constructively modulate negative feelings in problem-solving while the anxious-ambivalent attachment style is characterized by clinging, neediness and ambivalent feelings within the relationship. Avoidant attached individuals tend to feel insecure about demonstrating vulnerability, and tend to focus outside the relationship in times of conflict in order to avoid possible rejection (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Main & Weston, 1982). Situations of conflict or disagreement pose a threat to the stability of the relationship and trigger the attachment system. It would therefore be expected that persons with different attachment styles would react differently in these situations. For example, Levy & Davis (1988) found that secure attachment style was positively associated with satisfaction and mutually focused conflict strategies while the anxious/ambivalent and avoidant styles were negatively associated with these features.

Pistole (1989) found significant differences existed among attachment style classifications with respect to different styles of conflict resolution including *integrating, compromising* and *obliging*. Subjects who were classified in the secure attachment style were found to have been more likely to have used the *integrating* strategy than both anxious/ambivalent and avoidant individuals. Securely attached subjects were also found to use *compromising* skills more than anxious/ambivalent subjects. Finally, anxious/ambivalent subjects were more likely to *oblige* their partners in conflict than were avoidant subjects. These findings are consistent with

attachment theory, assuming an important conflict with the partner is perceived as a threat of separation or rejection attachment behaviours would be activated to preserve the bond (Pistole, 1989).

Gaines, Jr., et al. (1997) conducted four studies examining reactions to accommodative dilemmas and modes of reaction – "exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect" in close relationships as it related to attachment style. According to Gaines, Jr., et al. (1997), accommodative dilemmas are "interdependence situations in which an interaction partner enacts a potentially destructive behaviour" (93). They claim that the area of coping with threatening interpersonal experiences has been relatively neglected in the attachment literature. Studies that have explored the relationship between attachment style and coping with threatening interpersonal experiences have demonstrated that insecure versus secure individuals:

(a) display higher levels of withdrawal, coercion, and verbal aggression during conflict
(b) are less likely to enact cooperative problem-solving behaviours, including both compromise and integrative solutions
(c) experience less comfort with mutuality in communication
(d) are less effective at establishing and mobilizing support networks
(e) are less skilled at providing partners with emotional comfort and support (Gaines et al., 1997).

According to Gaines, Jr., et al. (1997), the majority of these studies have focused on relatively mildly threatening situations, thus not addressing situations that "might be expected to be maximally challenging to felt security" (95).

It is debatable whether it is actually necessary to use more "extreme" situations in order to evoke attachment thought and behaviour. For example, the study discussed earlier by Pistole (1989) demonstrated significant differences in conflict-resolution between attachment style classifications. The conflict resolution that was used in her study was considered to be one of the more mild uses referred to by Gaines, Jr. et al (1997). Nonetheless, it is important to keep in mind that the

catalyst used to trigger the attachment system, as aforementioned, is somewhat arbitrary and subjective, and it is therefore worthwhile exploring different so-called triggers to examine whether attachment style differences exist across these situations.

Bouthillier et al., (2002) conducted a study assessing the predictive validity of AAI versus self-report attachment style questionnaires with respect to emotion regulation behaviours in conflict situations using the Interactional Dimensions Coding System (Kline et al., in press) to code problem-solving interactions via videotape. The authors found that AAI classifications were predictive of proactive emotion regulation behaviour, whereas the two self-report style questionnaires used in the study (AAS; C. Hazan & P.Shaver, 1987 and AAQ; J.A. Simpson, 1990) were not. This study demonstrates the variability in the findings with respect to attachment style and behaviour in conflict situations, a discrepancy that mandates more in-depth exploration.

Creasey (2002) and Creasey & Hesson-McInnis (2001) have investigated the relationship between working models of attachment and conflict-tactics and conflict-management behaviour in young adults and adolescents involved in romantic relationships. Using the AAI to measure attachment, subjects were observed across two experimental conditions that were designed to provoke conflict management behaviour. Creasey (2002) found that individual differences in attachment classifications according to the AAI predicted both positive and negative conflict management behaviour.

Creasey & Hesson-McInnis (2001) constructed a path-analytic model to assess conflict in romantic relationships in a sample of college students (N = 357). Adolescents who were classified as insecurely attached were predicted to report more negative affect during conflict, less confidence dealing with the disagreement, and

less effective conflict-tactics than individuals who were classified as secure. In general, these predictions were supported in the study. More avoidant and anxious-ambivalent subjects reported less effective conflict-tactics than did secure subjects (Creasey & Hesson-McInnis, 2001).

Gallo & Smith (2001) investigated the relationship between attachment style and marital functioning, with a focus on cognition as an important link between the two. Married partners completed attachment style questionnaires and measures of negative attributions and perceived marital support and conflict. The authors found that attachment style was related to adjustment and to attribution style, and that anxious-ambivalent attachment was more predictive than avoidant attachment. The interaction of partners' attachment styles also served to predict marital functioning. In a number of cases, the use of negative attribution mediated the effects of attachment style on marital adjustment (Gallo & Smith, 2001). Couples also participated in two social situation manipulation tasks and completed measures assessing their spouses' behaviour following the tasks. The authors found that attachment style interacted with the tasks to affect spouse appraisals (263).

Simpson et al. (1996) investigated the relationship between attachment style and how dating partners and relationships change following attempts to solve a problem in their relationships. Couples were videotaped trying to resolve a major issue or problem in their relationship. Confirming attachment theory predictions, anxious-ambivalent and avoidant attached subjects perceived their partners and relationships in less positive terms after discussing a major problem (Simpson et al., 1996). Results highlighted important differences between avoidant and anxious-ambivalent subjects in terms of the way in which they perceived and responded to threatening events. Anxious-ambivalent women demonstrated particularly high levels

of stress and anxiety and engaged in negative interactions. Avoidant men were found to be generally less warm and supportive, especially when discussing the relationship problem.

Fitzpatrick et al. (1993) predicted that couples in different types of marriages would report different styles of communication during conflict. The authors found that "separate marital types" and "independent marital types" demonstrated avoidant attachment styles, whereas "traditional marital types" had the most secure attachment style and demonstrated more preoccupation or concern with their relationships. "Independent marital types" demonstrated more dismissive styles with respect to their relationships (Fitzpatrick et al., 1993).

Shi (2003) conducted a study with 448 undergraduate college students in a large university in the southwestern United States assessing whether attachment style was predictive of conflict resolution behaviours and satisfaction in romantic relationships. Both attachment style and conflict resolution were conceptualized along two dimensions, model of self and model of other, and concern for self and concern for other, respectively. Both anxious-ambivalent and avoidant attachment styles were found to be predictive of conflict resolution behaviours and relationship satisfaction (Shi, 2003).

Overall, in attachment and non-attachment conflict-related studies, a plethora of correlations have been demonstrated between conflict behaviour and cognition and other factors such as attachment style and marital satisfaction. Many of the findings seem inherently obvious, but ultimately there is a sense of unfinished business, or unfocused business, in this domain. In assessing dyadic reflective function in situations of marital conflict, an attempt is being made to make important developmental links that could be incredibly insightful in the therapeutic situation.

The relationship between reflective function and attachment will be explored in the following sections, including studies that have demonstrated its effectiveness. The place that dyadic reflective function holds, or might hold, in the realm of romantic attachment will be also be addressed, both following an examination of a social psychological concept that holds important ties to dyadic reflective function, empathic accuracy.

1.6 Empathic accuracy

1.6.1 What is empathic accuracy?

The earliest uses of the word empathy were all based on the notion of projection (Ickes, 2003). From the beginning, empathy was a concept with many hangers upon which many different meanings and interpretations have been placed. Reik (1948) stated that the word empathy sometimes means one thing, sometimes another, until now it does not mean anything.

Carl Rogers was one of the first psychologists to imbue the concept of empathy with special significance. Rogers talked about *accurate empathy* as being one of three critical components in therapeutic change (Rogers, 1957).

Empathic accuracy is a social psychological concept that in many ways mirrors the developmental concept of dyadic reflective function. Empathic accuracy is a measure of a perceiver's ability to accurately infer the specific content of another person's thoughts and feelings (Ickes, 1993). Social psychologist William Ickes and his colleagues operationalised the concept of empathic accuracy in their laboratory using videotaped interactions and third party coding.

1.6.2 Measuring empathic accuracy

The original goals in measuring empathic accuracy were that one person would generate his/her own inferences about the thoughts and feelings of another person, which would allow for an assessment of these inferences based on the actual thoughts and feelings of the target person; a measure that would take into account the accuracy of the perceiver's inferences over time (Ickes, 2003).

Ickes and his colleagues developed a measure of empathic accuracy based on, but distinct from Kagan's (1997) technique, which used video-taped therapy sessions to code the target's thoughts and feelings. Kagan's system did not however allow for the perceiver to generate his/her own inferences about the target's thoughts and feelings (Ickes, 2003).

Ickes and his colleagues created a software program to rate the accuracy of inferences called *Content Accuracy*. This was later replaced by more sophisticated programs such as *Rate* by Stephen Trued and *Read Your Mind* by Golden Strader where raters compared actual thoughts or feelings with inferred thoughts or feelings using a rating system from 0 to 2 (Ickes, 2003).

The measure of empathic accuracy was first applied to opposite-sex strangers and later applied to couples in romantic relationships.

1.6.3 Validity of empathic accuracy measure

As the measure was first applied to opposite-sex strangers then to friends and partners in romantic relationships, friends were shown to display more empathic accuracy than would strangers (Graham, 1994; Stinson & Ickes, 1992). Along these lines, the more knowledge people had about others' thoughts and feelings, the higher their ratings of empathic accuracy (Marangoni, Garcia, Ickes, & Teng, 1995). And, perceivers who were given a "frame" for interpreting targets' thoughts and feelings

were rated with higher empathic accuracy than those who were given no frame, or inaccurate frames (Kelleher, 1998). Perceivers' empathic accuracy has been shown to depend more on verbal behaviour than on their nonverbal behaviour (Gesn & Ickes, 1999).

1.6.4 Empathic accuracy in couple relationships

The ability to interpret and understand other peoples' emotions has been demonstrated to be an important skill in everyday social interactions as well as a critical component in the social concepts of social intelligence (Thorndike, 1920) and emotional intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1995; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Senecal, Murard, & Hess, 2003).

There are a number of factors that influence empathic accuracy in couple interactions (Senecal et al., 2003). Partners in a couple usually know each other quite well. In order to understand someone well, one must be able to take the other's perspective (Ickes & Simpson, 1997) and this inevitably requires a certain amount of detailed knowledge of the other person (Ickes, 1993). Stereotypic and generalized information regarding the other's sex, ethnicity, class, social group, etc. affect one's empathic accuracy. Members of couples develop private meaning systems (Gottman, 1979; Gottman & Porterfield, 1981), which lead to couple specific interpretations of behavioural information (Thomas, Fletcher, & Lange, 1997). Display rules exist, which can be gender based or class based or culture based, etc. (Ekman & Friesen, 1969) where there are implicit rules for social displays that are pervasive and ingrained from very early in life.

1.6.5 Empathic accuracy, marital satisfaction and marital conflict

An obvious element to analyze regarding the advantages of empathic accuracy in couple relationships is whether more empathic accuracy is related to and/or predicts greater marital/relationship satisfaction and better conflict resolution. The relationship between empathic accuracy and marital/relationship satisfaction and conflict resolution has been examined in a number of studies, which has resulted in two main groups of findings: one, which demonstrates a significant relationship between empathic accuracy and marital/relationship satisfaction and conflict resolution and the second, which demonstrates the inverse with respect to marital/relationship satisfaction.

According to Kilpatrick, Bissonnette, & Rusbult (2002), the empirical literature tends to suggest that "accurate understanding" tends to be related with greater marital adjustment, though there are some noteworthy exceptions. This will be addressed in more detail in the predictive validity study discussed in chapter five.

Evidence has demonstrated that the longer the relationship between two people, the higher the empathic accuracy, except for married couples in Western cultures where empathic accuracy apparently declines over time (Ickes, 2003; Swensen, Eskew, & Kolhepp, 1981; Thomas et al., 1997). Another somewhat counterintuitive observation is that the lower the interpersonal trust scores between members of a couple, the higher the empathic accuracy scores (Ickes, 2003). These counterintuitive results point to the complex nature that empathic accuracy holds. Is being empathically accurate always a positive trait? Does more empathic accuracy mean that couples will be more satisfied? It is clear that the answer is a definitive yes and no.

1.6.6 Empathic accuracy and attachment security

Jeff Simpson is primarily an attachment researcher. He and William Ickes combined forces to investigate the nature of secure and insecure attachment and empathic accuracy. They found that in high-threat conditions, insecure, but highly interdependent couples demonstrated more motivated inaccuracy. Couples who demonstrated the highest empathic accuracy were secure, low-interdependent couples in low-threat conditions. They found that not accurately predicting each other's thoughts and feelings actually enabled couples to protect their relationships from long-term damage (Simpson, Ickes, & Grich, 1999).

According to Ickes (2003), "research findings suggest that for the average relationship partner, the motive to avoid unpleasant realities is stronger than the motive to confront them" (243). Along similar lines, research findings also suggest that most dating and married partners prefer to "look on the bright side" and to ignore the so-called "darker" aspects (Ickes, 2003).

Simpson (1999), hypothesized that anxious-ambivalently attached people, in threatening situations, would be increasingly alert and aware of their partners' thoughts and feelings, thereby demonstrating more empathic accuracy. He found that this was true for women, but not for men. Dugosh (1998) also found that anxious women demonstrated higher empathic accuracy. On the flipside, it was apparent that avoidant women demonstrated low empathic accuracy, but not avoidant men.

These findings appear to paint a darker picture of what on the surface would appear to be a crucial skill to have, especially when involved in a romantic relationship. There are also plenty of findings to the contrary. Rather than nullifying the elaborate research that has been conducted; as aforementioned, these diverse findings really flesh out the complexity that is involved in couple relationships,

interpersonal functioning and relationship satisfaction. Some of the "lighter" side of empathic accuracy is presented below.

Kilpatrick, et al., (2002) suggested that in conflict interaction, empathic accuracy will more than likely be related to more prosocial motivation and behaviour: "empathic accuracy frequently serves as a positive function during conflict by promoting prosocial transformation, thereby encouraging accommodative behaviour and promoting enhanced couple well-being" (371).

Some studies have suggested that happier couples tend to produce higher levels of empathic accuracy (Kilpatrick, Bissonnette, & Rusbult, 2002; Noller, 1980; Noller & Ruzzene, 1991; Noller & Venardos, 1986).

More highly educated partners and partners married for a shorter period of time have been found to demonstrate greater empathic accuracy (Thomas et al., 1997). The authors hypothesized that better educated people might produce greater empathic accuracy scores because better educated people might be smarter and more able to use information and make empathic judgments, and they may be more motivated to concentrate on "problem-solving" discussion (Thomas et al., 1997).

1.6.7 Empathic accuracy and projection

Fletcher and Kininmonth (1992) examined the relationship between attributions, or, projections, and marital satisfaction. They posited that there are "compelling theoretical reasons" to assume that there is a direct link between marital satisfaction and projection, successful relationships being associated with higher degrees of similarity, or assumed similarity between members of a couple. They also found that none of the distal variables that measured positivity in relationships such as marital satisfaction and verbal positivity, were significantly related to empathic accuracy and claimed that, "the research literature in this area has an atheoretical feel

to it...in the main confining itself to reporting correlations between distal variables and levels of accuracy" (839). What they did find was some evidence that projection was related to empathic accuracy.

1.6.8 Gender differences in empathic accuracy

According to Senecal et al. (2003), findings have been diverse and somewhat contradictory regarding gender performance in empathic accuracy. Women have been shown to rate their target emotional reactions as more intense for happiness, fear, anger and sadness than men. Women have also been found to rate themselves as reacting with more sadness in fear situations as well as with less anger in happiness situations, whereas men reported more anger for guilt situations. Women have been shown to expect more withdrawing behaviour in men than the men actually said they felt.

Eisenberg & Lennon (1983) found that when couples were not told that the task(s) they were performing had something to do with empathy there were no significant differences in male-female performances. But when couples were told that what they were doing was related to a measure of empathy, women had significantly higher scores than men.

As aforementioned with regard to the attachment studies examining the relationship between attachment style and empathic accuracy, anxious-ambivalent women were found to have higher levels of empathic accuracy, but men weren't and avoidant women were found to have lower levels empathic accuracy, but men weren't. The reasons for this gender divide with respect to attachment style and empathic accuracy are unknown.

1.6.9 Summary of key findings

There are three main findings regarding the empathic accuracy studies that are especially pertinent and worth reiterating. The first pertains to the conflicting findings with respect to marital or relationship satisfaction and empathic accuracy. The second has to do with the empathic accuracy and attachment studies conducted by Ickes and Simpson et al. The third, which is related to the second concerning attachment style, concerns gender differences in empathic accuracy.

What has resulted theoretically from the conflicting findings concerning empathic accuracy and relationship satisfaction is the deduction that empathic accuracy can help a relationship and it can hinder a relationship depending on the situation, the individual and the couple. It appears that in situations that are threatening to the relationship, less empathic accuracy can actually serve to preserve and protect the relationship. This resonates with studies that have demonstrated that more depressed people tend to be more honest and accurate about themselves and their situation, thereby fuelling the depression. The bottom line is that it appears that empathic accuracy is clearly not always the best policy.

This segues into the next issue of attachment style and empathic accuracy and the question of 'what works for whom'? What should be readily apparent by now is that this is clearly not something that remains the same across situations, but that empathic accuracy is also something that suits different types of people. The findings by Simpson and Ickes, et al. discussed earlier revealed the fact that anxious-ambivalent women had higher empathic accuracy, while avoidant women had lower empathic accuracy. These findings did not apply to the men, which brings us to the third issue regarding gender differences and empathic accuracy.

Not only were the attachment related findings gender specific but women and men were found to differ with respect to their empathic accuracy if they were clued into what it was that was being assessed. When they did not know what was being assessed, there were no significant differences between them regarding empathic accuracy. When they did know, women scored significantly higher than men.

1.6.10 Empathic accuracy and dyadic reflective function

Empathic accuracy and dyadic reflective function are intrinsically related concepts born from different theoretical "mothers". Empathic accuracy scores are derived at based on third party assessments of couple interactions. Empathic accuracy takes into account each partner's perspective of the other's thoughts and feelings. Dyadic reflective functioning scores, which will be elaborated on in the following chapter, are derived from comparing self-reported feelings and thoughts from both members of the couple. One key difference, aside from using self-report versus coding videotaped interactions, is that the Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire (DRFQ) does not only assess the first level of meta-cognition (what you think your partner thinks/feels), but it also assesses second and third levels of meta-cognition (what you think your partner thinks you feel and what you think your partner thinks you think he/she feels) as well as how people think their partners said they behaved during a jointly selected disagreement.

Another important difference between empathic accuracy and dyadic reflective functioning pertains to the respective theoretical "mothers" referred to earlier. As aforementioned, in their assessment of the empathic accuracy literature, Fletcher and Kininmonth (1992) claimed it had an *atheoretical* feeling to it. Though their have been studies conducted that assess the relationship between empathic accuracy and dyadic satisfaction and attachment security, it is a concept that is

floating in the clinical biosphere. Dyadic reflective functioning is a concept that is rooted in development. Reflective functioning has been theorized to have important clinical and practical implications (Fonagy et al., 1998). This is important not just for research purposes, but clinically as well. The relevance of the concept of reflective function as well as clinical and empirical implications will be elaborated on further in the following sections followed by an introduction of the concept of dyadic reflective function, including the inception and piloting of the Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire (DRFQ).

1.7 Reflective function

1.7.1 What is reflective function?

Reflective function or mentalization, as the term is also known, can be conceptualized as a form of meta-cognition, the ability to think about thinking, and to reflect upon one's own and other's mental states. According to Fonagy & Target (1997), reflective function is the developmental acquisition that permits the child to respond not only to other people's behaviour, but to his *conception* of their beliefs, feelings, hopes, pretense, plans, and so on. It is a concept that has been central to psychoanalytic, attachment and cognitive and developmental theories (Fonagy, 2001), and like other concepts such as projective identification, it has been imbued with many different meanings, roles and significances by respective theorists (Auerbach & Blatt, 1996; Bion, 1962a, 1962b, 1967; Bucci, 1997; Dennett, 1978; Dunn & Brown, 1993; Freud, 1911; Green, 1975; Holmes, 2001; Klein, 1945; Lecours & Bouchard, 1997; Luquet, 1987; Marty, 1990, 1991). Due to certain limitations, it is not possible to address the many contributions of varied theorists in this thesis. An emphasis will be placed on the work of Fonagy et al. in the development of the concept of reflective

function, and the ensuing development of the Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire (DRFQ).

1.7.2 Reflective function and attachment security

Fonagy and Target (1998) have demonstrated that attachment between infant and caregiver is the "critical mediator" with respect to the development of the capacity to mentalize. The ability to read another's mind depends upon the attachment security of the individual, to feel secure enough in making attributions of mental states to account for the behaviour of the caregiver (Fonagy & Target, 1997). Just as secure individuals feel safe enough in making attributions of mental states, insecure individuals will be much more reluctant to do so. The relationship between attachment security and the capacity to mentalize has been tested empirically, and will be explored further in the following sections.

1.7.3 The development of reflective function

It has been demonstrated that the development of the ability to mentalize is not universal, but rather a developmental achievement (Fonagy & Target, 1996). It is connected with interactions and processes in early relationships, primarily that of the child with his/her primary caregiver.

Fonagy and Target (1996) proposed a theory of development of mentalization to describe its normal development in children. Until approximately three or four years old, children have two modes of relating their internal worlds to external reality. One is to expect that things in the external world will inevitably conform to their internal reality. In play, the child is aware that his/her internal world is not the same as external reality, so instead of internal and external being conceived of as identical, in play, they are conceived of as having no relationship at all.

Mentalization, or the reflective mode, comes when the child is able to integrate his/her internal world with external reality. According to Fonagy et al. (1996), mentalization comes about through the child's experience of his mental states being reflected on. This facilitates integration of the pretend and psychic equivalence modes, through a process which may be an elaboration of the complex mirroring of the infant by the caregiver. Children at this stage are able to reflect upon the differences between their internal worlds and external reality.

Traumatized children are not able to reach this second stage of integration and mentalization. An inability to accept and distinguish between internal and external is reflected in the extremely rigid style of play in nursery children with disorganized attachments. In other words, secure attachment provides the child the foundation for the understanding of the complexity of the relationship between his/her internal world and external reality, which is reflected in the child's ability to mentalize, to understand that his/her parents' thoughts do not mirror his/her own thoughts, and that predicting their behaviour will involve more than thinking about how he/she (the child) would think or act in a given situation.

Further development, growth and change of reflective function should by no means be considered linearly, whereby progression along a line reflects health or "normality", and deviation from this line reflects pathology or "abnormality". This is a simplistic way to conceive of an incredibly complex and dynamic process.

Fonagy and Target (1997) conceive of reflective function as a complex control system that is critical to the organization of the self. This is a skill that is not "simply a property of the person, but of the person and situation together, because all skills are composed of both the person's activities and the contexts within which these occur"

(694). There are an infinite number of variables that contribute to the development of this skill, including relationships, emotions and one's environment.

Reflective function should be understood as representing a piece of the developmental puzzle that is connected to other pieces of the puzzle, but not wholly dependent upon them. Circumstances, events, emotional triggers, etc. will consciously or unconsciously impact the ability to mentalize in a given situation with a given person. This "unevenness" across situations and relationships is expected to exist in adulthood just as it does in childhood.

Although it is impossible to generalize mentalizing abilities across relationships and situations, it seems that a child with an insecure attachment to his/her primary caregiver will be significantly more exposed to continued vulnerability in his/her interpersonal interactions and a continued impaired ability to mentalize, so that if the circle is unbroken, (it) may come to dominate all interpersonal relationships...adult entrenched personality disorder, is the likely consequence (Fonagy & Target, 1997).

1.7.4 Why improve reflective function?

It is theorized that psychotherapy has the potential to foster impaired reflective function among patients, and that this can relate to improvements in patients' behaviour and symptoms, and increase patients' resiliency to future stressors. Fonagy & Target (1998) stated that they believe that a therapeutic program that engages in a systematic effort to enhance mentalization holds the promise of increasing the effectiveness of psychoanalysis.

With increased reflective function, impaired self and object relations can begin to be transformed through new experiences with significant others, beginning with the therapist. This process over time is theorized to assist patients in developing intimate

relations that are less infused with aggression, greater capacity for intimacy, increased coherence of identity, a reduction in self-defeating and destructive behaviours, and general improvements in symptoms and functioning (Fonagy et al., 1998).

Mentalizing can help an individual to achieve deeper experiences with others, and ultimately a life experienced as more meaningful. According to Fonagy et al. (1998), it is the successful connecting of internal and external which allows belief to be endowed with meaning which is emotionally alive, but manageable.

1.7.5 How does one improve reflective function?

Improving reflective function involves exploring, naming and understanding one's own emotional states, including the relationship between somatic experience and affect. This is a process that can be facilitated by the analyst, by introducing other perspectives, and reflecting on the mind of the patient as well as on other people who are close to him/her.

People who are unable to reflect on their own mental states will probably not be able to reflect on others'. This work can be done in different ways. For example, an analyst can work with transference interpretations in order to help the patient to see and think about his/her thoughts, feelings and emotions with respect to the analyst.

The majority of the literature on reflective function refers to the processes that develop in children with respect to infant-caregiver relationships. The implications of reflective function in couple relationships will be discussed shortly, following a review of relevant empirical evidence.

1.7.6 Empirical support for reflective function

Empirical investigations into mentalizing capabilities have been confined to a more distinct body of research pioneered by Fonagy and his colleagues (1991a) with the development of the Reflective Function Scale (RF Scale), a coding system

designed to ascertain one's degree of reflective function based on narrative assessment of the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI). In this section, the development of the Reflective Function Scale is reviewed along with studies that have validated the measure and other empirical work investigating the relevance of reflective function in the literature.

1.7.7 Development of the Reflective Function Scale

The Reflective Function Scale (Fonagy, Steele, & Steele, 1991a) was originally developed as part of the London Parent-Child Project. In a study with 100 pregnant women in the London Parent-Child Project, subjects were interviewed in their homes during pregnancy. Ratings of the interviews with the mothers were conducted before the children were one year old. Fathers were also interviewed and rated before the child was 18 months old. After interviews with the parents were conducted, the baby was assessed with either the mother or father using the Strange Situation Procedure (Ainsworth, Blehar, Water, & Wall, 1978). Interviews were rated by a number of judges and scale points were broadly apportioned.

The reflective function ratings were compared with the demographic characteristics of the subjects and on the whole there was an absence of relationships between reflective function scores and demographic characteristics (Fonagy et al., 1998). Psychometric analysis of AAIs demonstrated that ratings on reflective function were the "strongest contributors to judges' assessment of attachment security, and accounted for more than half of the variance in the secure/insecure distinction" (15). There was also a strong relationship between mothers' and fathers' scores on the RF scale and the Strange Situation behaviour of infants. Mothers with higher reflective function were significantly more likely to have securely attached children based on performance in the Strange Situation task.

1.7.7.1 London Parent-Child Project (1994)

In a later study using the same sample, it was found that reflective function was particularly predictive of infants' secure attachments with mothers in cases where mothers independently reported deprivation in childhood (Fonagy, Steele, Steele, Higgitt, & Target, 1994). Subjects were split into groups of those who experienced high deprivation in childhood and those who experienced low deprivation in childhood based on a number of characteristics including prolonged separation from parents before age eleven, etc. Subjects were also divided into two groups based on low and high scores of reflective function. In the deprived group, 100% of subjects with high reflective function had secure children and only 6% with low reflective function had secure children (Fonagy et al., 1998). These results demonstrate that reflective function is particularly important in aiding attachment security between mother and child where the mother has suffered social deprivation in childhood.

1.7.7.2 The Cassel Hospital Study

In a study conducted with non-psychotic inpatients at the Cassel Hospital in London, Adult Attachment Interviews were administered to all of the subjects and coded for reflective function by two raters. A number of interesting findings with respect to reflective function were attained. Patients without Axis II diagnoses based on the SCID-I and SCID-II (DSM-III-R) were rated higher on reflective function than those with Axis II diagnoses ($p<.05$). This significant finding was mainly due to the low reflective function scores of patients with Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD) ($p<.001$) (Fonagy et al., 1998). Also, the likelihood of reported abuse being associated with BPD was greater in the group of patients with low reflective function than with those whose reflective function ratings were above the median (19).

1.7.7.3 The Prison Health Care Centre Study

Twenty-two prisoners referred to the Prison Health Care Centre for psychiatric diagnoses, were administered the Adult Attachment Interview as well as other diagnostic instruments. Prisoners were included in the study if they had at least one Axis I or II disorder. The mean reflective function score in the prison group was significantly lower than that of the inpatient group referred to in the previous study ($p<.01$), and both groups had a lower mean reflective function score than the normal control group in a study discussed earlier in the London Parent-Child Project. Though this study was too small (n=22) to draw too many convincing conclusions, Fonagy et al. (1998) concluded that the RF scale appears promising in distinguishing criminal groups with mental disorder from groups with similar disorders but without criminal tendencies.

1.7.7.4 Reflective Function in children

In another study by the same authors, mothers' reflective function assessed in prenatal interviews, was found to be highly predictive of their children's success in the Belief Desire Reasoning Task ($r(90)=.32$, $p<.001$) controlling for both the mothers' and the child's verbal ability.

1.7.7.5 Discriminant validity of the RF Scale

The RF Scale was related to a number of psychometric instruments to demonstrate its discriminant validity including Epstein's Mother-Father-Peer Scale, Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire and Langner's 22 Sources of Self Esteem Inventory. No significant associations were found between the RF Scale and any of these instruments (Fonagy et al., 1998).

1.7.8 Talking about feelings, language, and mother-infant interactions in development of reflective function

Dunn and Brown (1993) found that conversations about one's feelings and about the reasons behind people's actions were associated with a relatively earlier achievement of reflective function (Fonagy & Target, 1997).

In a related study by Denham et al. (1994), three-year-olds whose mothers spontaneously explained their emotions in a laboratory procedure, were more likely to show more elaborate understanding of emotion over the next 15 months (Fonagy & Target, 1997).

Patterns of interactions between mothers and their infants have also been found to be associated with the reflective capacity of children (Dunn, 1996). Patterns that are characteristic of secure attachment such as shared play, comforting, or joking (Fonagy & Target, 1997) have been found to facilitate reflective function in children. "The parent's capacity to observe the moment to moment changes in the child's mental state, then, lies at the root of sensitive care-giving, which is viewed by attachment theorists as the cornerstone of secure attachment" (691). The secure attachment that is created, in large part as a result of the attunement of the parent's interpretations of their children's wishes and behaviour, provides the "psychosocial basis for acquiring an understanding of mind" (691).

In a longitudinal study by Meins and her colleagues (1998), the development of symbolic and mentalizing abilities was measured in 33 children whose attachment security was assessed in infancy. The authors found that securely attached children were more able to accept the experimenter's suggestions regarding symbolic play at 31 months.

Secure children also performed better on a version of Wimmer and Perner's (1983) unexpected transfer task at age four. There was also evidence that the secure group of children demonstrated superior mentalizing abilities at age five. This difference was found despite the fact that there was no intra-group difference found in general cognitive abilities.

Though it has been demonstrated that reflective function is directly related to the security of the mother-infant attachment and the ensuing interaction patterns that are associated with this secure bond, it is important to reiterate that the development of reflective function does not occur along a single pathway. According to Fonagy & Target (1997) it is melded by many dynamically interacting influences, such as the individual's emotions, social interaction, family relationships and environment, important social groups, the reactions of the wider social world, etc.

The vast majority of mentalizing-related empirical research has been concentrated on the parent-infant relationship and the developmental trajectory of mentalizing abilities. There has been a relative dearth in the exploration of mentalizing abilities in other relationships, that being the goal of the present study, specifically with romantic relationships. In the following section, other applications of the RF Scale will be reviewed as well as further theoretical and clinical considerations regarding the application of the concept of dyadic reflective function to couple relationships, which has culminated in the development of a self-report style measure of dyadic reflective function for use with couples.

1.7.9 Other applications of reflective function

In an ongoing study with pregnant couples, Lis, Zennaro and Mazzeschi (2000), applied the RF scale developed by Fonagy and his colleagues (1991, 1997 & 1998), to the *Clinical Interview for Parents During Pregnancy* (Lis & Zennaro, 1997;

Zennaro & Ascari, 1995). They assessed reflective function in the couple as a whole, by averaging the score for each partner, and for each individual member of the couple, for three specific areas: the couple relationship, the individuals' relationships with their parents, and the child-to-be. One hundred and twelve first-time parent couples living in Northern Italy were recruited as subjects for the study.

The authors found that, in line with Fonagy et al.'s (1991) findings, neither social-class, socioeconomic status, nor maternal or paternal education were significantly related to reflective function scores. Of the three scales (couple, parent and child) referred to earlier, the child scale had the highest means for reflective function. This was not surprising considering the situation and the existing pregnancy literature (Gerson, 1989). Parents-to-be had more passages of low and medium-high reflective function with respect to their future children than in the other areas.

Overall, it was demonstrated that the couples as couples and as individuals were thinking more about their expected children than about their own relationships and their relationships with their parents, but the level of sophistication for the vast majority of the transcripts was quite low. The parents in this study seemed to need to talk quite a bit about their expected children while avoiding the use of explicit or genuine reflective self-function (Lis, Zennaro, & Mazzeschi, 2000).

Though the authors of this study adapted the Reflective Function Scale to assess the couple relationship, the interaction of the responses of the couple was not assessed in ascertaining a reflective function score. In other words, the couple was treated exclusively as two separate individuals, and not as a unit or an entity in and of itself. The individuals in the respective couples discussed aspects of their relationships concerning, for example, changes in their marriage, and they were rated

independently for their reflective function, irrespective of the other's responses. The couple rating was achieved solely by averaging the individual's scores.

A more in-depth examination of the couple might entail an assessment of the ability of the respective partners to think about and understand, not just how the individuals themselves feel, but about how they think their partners feel concerning the respective areas, and how they think their partners feel about them. This act of perspective taking, which is one of the focuses of the Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire (DRFQ) developed in the present study, is an essential element in the reflective function process, and is especially relevant in the couple relationship (versus in the parent-child relationship).

1.8 Reflective function and couples (Dyadic Reflective Function)

Thinking about reflective function in couples is quite different from individuals for some very obvious reasons. Some of these issues will be discussed in the following sub-sections with respect to the couple relationship and the relevance of reflective function in the couple therapeutic situation. In order to clearly distinguish between the concepts of reflective function developed by Fonagy et al. (1997) where reflective function is assessed via the child-caregiver relationship, and reflective function in couple relationships as assessed via the Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire (DRFQ), reflective function in couples will henceforth solely be referred to as *dyadic reflective function.*

1.8.1 Possible signs of high and low dyadic reflective function

Some possible signs of high and low dyadic reflective function have been discussed with respect to perspective taking. What more would we expect of an individual with higher dyadic reflective capacities? One thing we would expect

would be that the individual would be able to acknowledge good and bad, and strength and weakness in him/herself and in his/her partner. This demonstrates a capacity to integrate that recalls Klein's depressive position. The flipside would be someone who is only able to see things in black or white, unable to reflect on him/herself or on his/her partner as a whole human being with both good and bad qualities.

Inter-psychically speaking, another thing to look for in a couple with higher dyadic reflective function would be that one's perceptions of one's partner are corroborated by the partner him/herself. This demonstrates an ability to reflect on oneself and on one's partner in a mature way that goes beyond projections of one's own thoughts and feelings onto one's partner.

Identifying difference is a complicated task. Difference might arise in a situation between two romantic partners when one or both partners are unable to reflect in a flexible manner on a given situation. 'He thinks this and I think that, and never the twain shall meet'. Another type of couple might not be able to acknowledge difference at all because of the threat that it holds for their relationship. It is necessary for this type of couple to always agree, and to maintain "sameness" in the relationship at all times. These couples essentially cannot accept a third in their relationship. There is no room for difference and there is no room for reflective space.

Cultivating the ability to withdraw negative projections, to integrate and reflect upon one's own and one's partner's thoughts and feelings, and to put oneself in another's shoes and take different perspectives, represent fruitful goals in couple relationships and for couples in therapy. It mandates flexibility of behaviour and thought, and it is at the core of the concept of dyadic reflective function.

In the following chapter, a self-report measure of dyadic reflective function will be introduced, its foundation and construction explicated, followed by the piloting of the questionnaire with twenty couples where dyadic reflective function is assessed alongside attachment style and certain demographic variables.

CHAPTER 2. THE CONSTRUCTION AND PILOTING OF THE DYADIC REFLECTIVE FUNCTIONING QUESTIONNAIRE (DRFQ)

2.1 Introduction

The Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire (DRFQ) was developed as an instrument to measure the dyadic reflective capacity of individuals in romantic relationships in situations of disagreement. The measure pertains specifically to romantic couples and to a specific situation of disagreement, assuming that dyadic reflective function cannot be generalized across relationships, or across situations.

The DRFQ contains 133 items, all rated on a 5-point Likert rating scale ranging from "*not at all, a little bit, moderately, quite a bit,* to *extremely.* The 134 items listed in appendix 2.5a & b were mainly adapted from the Therapy Session Report (Orlinsky & Howard, 1966) and the Reflective Functioning Manual (Fonagy et al., 1998). The DRFQ is broken down into two main sections: the first, concentrating on oneself, and the second, concentrating on one's partner. The first sub-section in section one contains a list of *feeling* adjectives that the individual is asked to rate pertaining to how he/she was *feeling* during the disagreement. The second sub-section in the first main section contains a list of thirteen brief descriptions that the individual is asked to rate with respect to how he/she *was* during the disagreement. The third sub-section in the first main section contains fifteen descriptions that the individual is asked to rate as to how he/she *acted* during the disagreement (there are male-female versions of the questionnaire to minimize confusion in the questions).

The first, second and third sub-sections of section two follow the same format with the exception that section two is focused on the partner. In the first sub-section, participants are asked to respond to how they think their partners *felt* during the disagreement. In the second and third sub-sections, a participant rates how he/she

thinks his/her partner responded that he/she *was* during the disagreement and how he/she responded as to how he/she *acted* during the disagreement respectively.

There are two additional sub-sections that get increasingly more complicated in that participants rate, using the same set of *feeling* adjectives that were used in the first sub-sections of parts one and two: (1) what partner one thinks partner two thought that partner 1 was *feeling* during the disagreement, and (2) what partner one thinks their partner thought that partner one thought partner two was *feeling* during the disagreement.

In total, there are four sub-sections with the same *feeling* adjectives. In each sub-section, participants are challenged to take on an increasing degree of meta-cognition from self, to partner, to partner on self, to partner on self on partner.

2.2 Overview of procedures for the development and piloting of the DRFQ

1. An extensive literature review was conducted pertaining to reflective function, couple attachment and conflict in relationships (see chapter 1).
2. A review of relevant couple measures was conducted and analyzed according to subject matter (see **appendix 2.1**).
3. A sub-sample of relevant measures were further analyzed and drawn from in the creation of the initial draft of the DRFQ. The first draft contained 166 items.
4. The first draft of the measure was given to five subjects to review, complete and provide feedback (see **appendix 2.2** for feedback form).
5. Changes were made to the measure including clarifying and re-wording instructions, more clearly delineating sections and sub-sections and creating gender specific versions of the questionnaire.

6. The second draft of the questionnaire was then given to ten couples to complete along with their feedback.
7. Further revisions were made to the questionnaire based on the feedback from the ten couples. Thirty-two questions were eliminated based on feedback and face validity conducted by the author and an independent judge.
8. An initial system of analysis was developed, which resulted in the use of groups of intra-subject correlations and inter-subject correlations plus difference scores and t-values. The following is a matrix of the five inter-subject correlations that the dyadic reflective function accuracy scores are based on:

    - DRF 1: P1 v. P2 (P1) ["Feeling" adjectives]
    - DRF 2: P1 (P2) v. P2 (P1 (P2)) ["Feeling" adjectives]
    - DRF 3: P1 (P2 (P1)) v. P2 (P1 (P2 (P1))) ["Feeling" adjectives]
    - DRF 4: P1 v. P2 (P1) ["How the subjects *were*...]
    - DRF 5: P1 v. P2 (P1) ["How the subjects *acted*...]

    These five scores would represent the scores for Partner 2 (P2) because for each level he/she is being measured according to his/her ability to essentially predict how his/her partner *felt, was* and *acted* during the disagreement. The same scores would be calculated for Partner 1 (P1). The first three sets of correlations (DRF 1 – 3) pertain to the four sets of *feeling* adjectives referred to earlier. Each correlation measures the ability of one partner to put him/herself into his/her partner's shoes; to think about and reflect on how he/she felt in the disagreement, how his/her partner felt, and so on. The level of the first correlation tells us the degree to which partner two was able to accurately convey how partner one felt during the disagreement based on partner one's own responses. The second and third correlations become increasingly more complicated in that in each, there is an additional level of

meta-cognition required of the individual. The fourth and fifth sets of correlations pertain to the sections referred on how one and one's partner *was* during the disagreement and how one and one's partner *acted* during the disagreement. The crucial factor here is that individual's are not simply asked how they feel their partner was and acted during the disagreement, rather, individuals are asked to predict how their partners said they were and acted during the disagreement.

Correlations between individuals' responses were converted into Fisher's z-scores. This means that individuals can have scores below -1 and greater than 1. For example, partner one's responses to the nineteen adjectives on how he felt during the disagreement were correlated with partner two's responses to the same nineteen adjectives on what she thought partner one felt during the disagreement. The correlation score is then converted into a Fisher z-score and that represents partner two's DRF 1 score. An example of a high score would be .8 and above and an example of a low score would be .3 and below.

9. A third and final draft of the measure was developed and refined for piloting with twenty couples from the general population (see **tables 2.1 & 2.2**). The majority of the couples were recruited from the University College London subject pool. They were all opposite sex couples and they all completed the questionnaires with the test-giver present to answer any questions.
10. An attachment style self-report questionnaire called the Revised Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR-R) (Fraley et al., 2000) (see **appendix 2.3a**), was administered to the twenty couples participating in the pilot study along with a demographic sheet (see **appendix 2.4**) in addition to

the male and female versions of the DRFQ (see **appendices 2.5a & b**). Additional measures were applied in the larger study discussed in chapter four (see **appendices 2.3b – 2.3f**).

11. The first task of the couples participating in the pilot study was to jointly decide an issue of disagreement from a list of issues adapted from the Family Behaviour Survey (FBS) (see **appendix 2.6**). This list encompasses common issues that couples often disagree on, and it has been used for similar purposes in other studies (i.e. (Crowell et al., 2002). The Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire (DRFQ) and the revised Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR-R) were completed independently by both members of the couple. The participants were instructed to have in mind the last time that they disagreed on the jointly decided upon issue when they completed the DRFQ.

2.3 Subjects

Twenty couples were recruited for the pilot study from the University College London subject pool mainly for the purposes of examining the results of the DRFQ in relation to attachment-style scores and demographic variables. None of the couples were undergoing couple therapy at the time when the questionnaires were completed. Selected sample characteristics are summarized in tables 2.1 and 2.2:

Table 2.1: Sample Characteristics (By gender)

Characteristic		Male	Female
N		20	20
Age:	18-25	15%	35%
	25-35	65%	55%
	35-45	15%	5%
	45-60	5%	5%
Ethnicity:	White	65%	60%
	Hispanic/Latin	15%	20%
	Asian/Indian	15%	15%
	Other	5%	5%
Education Completed:			
	Secondary	25%	60%
	University	25%	20%
	Graduate	20%	15%
	Post-Graduate	40%	5%

Table 2.2: Sample Characteristics (By couple)

Characteristic		Couple
N		20
Marital Status:	Dating	15%
	Married	50%
	Co-habiting, but not married	35%
Time Together:	Less than a year	5%
	1-5 years	65%
	5-10 years	30%

2.4 Research questions

The following research questions were formulated based on research findings discussed in the literature review. The questions include only points that are relevant to the pilot study. More extensive questions and hypotheses are posed in the larger study that is presented in chapter four.

1. What is the nature of the relationship between Dyadic Reflective Function scores and attachment style?
2. What is the nature of the relationship between Dyadic Reflective Function scores and demographics such as age, length of relationship and education?
3. Will there be significant gender differences in the way men and women responded on the DRFQ.
4. What is the relationship between the five inter-correlation scores on the DRFQ?

2.5 Results

In the following sub-sections, the results for the relevant statistical analyses on gender differences, demographics and dyadic reflective function scores, reliability analysis and validating criteria for the DRFQ are explicated.

2.5.1 Gender differences in self-report

In order to examine gender difference in the way that subjects responded on the DRFQ, intra-class correlations and differences were compared between males and females using paired sample t-tests. There were no significant differences between men and women for any of these correlations. In table 2.3 the mean and standard deviations and t-values for men and women on the intra-subject correlations are displayed:

Table 2.3: Paired T-Tests on intra-class correlations & differences between genders

Comparison: -Correlation -Difference	Mean (S.D.) Male	Female	t-value *p<.05 *p<.01
Corr: On self v. On partner	.44(.35)	.44(.45)	-.078
Dif: On self v. On partner	-2.2(9.58)	2.45(9.96)	-1.31
Corr: On self v. Partner on self	.64(.45)	.88(.46)	-1.65
Dif: On self v. Partner on self	-.45(7.74)	-.4(6.26)	-.027
Corr: On self v. Partner on self on partner	.5(.35)	.45(.51)	.453
Dif: On self v. Partner on self on partner	.45(8.77)	1.5(9.32)	-.323
Corr: On partner v. Partner on self	.37(.46)	.44(.54)	-.52
Dif: On partner v. Partner on self	1.75(5.16)	-2.85(10.44)	1.72
Corr: On partner v. Partner on self on partner	.65(.37)	.75(.49)	-.747
Dif: On partner v. Partner on self on partner	2.65(6.27)	.95(7.79)	1.69
Corr: Partner on self v. Partner on self on partner	.58(.59)	.64(.65)	-.301
Dif: Partner on self v. Partner on self on partner	.9(4.6)	1.9(7.2)	-.541
Corr: On self v. On partner (How you were & acted during disagreement)	.2(.34)	.24(.48)	-.351
Dif: On self v. On partner (How you were & acted during disagreement)	.75(15.98)	6(14.8)	-.843

As aforementioned, and as demonstrated in table 2.3, there were no significant differences in the way that men and women responded on the DRFQ.

2.5.2 Demographics & Dyadic Reflective Function scores

An analysis was conducted of the relationship between individual demographic variables and the five DRF accuracy scores, plus the global individual score, which is the average of the five correlations for each subject on the DRFQ. Results from this analysis can be seen in tables 2.4a & b:

Tables 2.4a & b: Correlations of demographics & DRF Scores for men and women, respectively

P2 – Male, P1 - Female

	Age	Ethnicity	Education	P1 v P2(P1) (Feeling adjs.)	P1(P2) v P2(P1(P2)) (Feeling adjs.)	P1(P2(P1)) v P2 (P1 (P2 (P1))) (Feeling adjs.)	P1 v P2(P1) (How you were)	P1 v P2 (P1) (How you acted)	Global Individual
Age	1.00	-.100	-.088	-.377	-.039	-.063	-.202	.122	-.154
Ethnicity	-.100	1.00	.445**	-.058	-.280	.177	-.307	-.058	-.178
Education	-.088	.445**	1.00	-.105	-.072	.117	-.242	-.099	-.131
P1 v P2 (P1)	-.377	-.058	-.105	1.00	-.239	.557*	.501*	.084	.735**
P1(P2) v P2 (P1 (P2))	-.039	-.280	-.072	.239	1.00	.115	.262	.221	.618**
P1 (P2 (P1)) v P2 (P1 (P2 (P1)))	-.063	.177	.117	.557**	.115	1.00	-.033	.008	.530*
P1 v P2 (P1) (How she was v How he thinks she said she was)	-.202	-.307	-.242	.501*	.262	-.033	1.00	.178	.626**
P1 v P2 (P1) (How she acted v How he thinks she said she acted	.122	-.058	-.099	.084	.221	.008	.178	1.00	.526*
Global Individual	-.154	-.058	20	.735**	.618**	.530*	.626**	.526*	1.00

*** Correlation significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

	Age	Ethnicity	Education	P2 v P1(P2) (Feeling adjs.)	P2(P1) v P1(P2(P1)) (Feeling adjs.)	P2(P1(P2)) v P1 (P2 (P1 (P2))) (Feeling adjs.)	P2 v P1(P2) (How you were)	P2 v P1 (P2) (How you acted)	Global Individual
Age	1.00	.059	-.046	-.240	.024	.081	-.199	-.125	-.136
Ethnicity	.059	1.00	.511*	.234	-.055	-.041	.276	.081	.147
Education	-.046	.511*	1.00	.267	.235	.177	.447*	.303	.404
P2 v P1 (P2)	-.240	.234	.267	1.00	.134	.606**	.505*	.577**	.821**
P2(P1) v P1 (P2 (P1))	.024	-.055	.235	.134	1.00	.114	.328	.171	.462*
P2 (P1 (P2)) v P1(P2(P1(P2)))	.081	-.041	.177	.606**	.114	1.00	.328	.394	.706**
P2 v P1 (P2) (How she was v How he thinks she said she was)	-.199	.276	.447*	.505*	.328	.328	1.00	.502*	.756**
P2 v P1 (P2) (How she acted v How he thinks she said she acted	-.125	.081	.303	.577**	.171	.394	.502*	1.00	.760**
Global Individual	-.136	.147	.404	.821**	.462*	.706**	.756**	.760**	1.00

*** Correlation significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

For the men, there were no significant correlations between DRF accuracy scores and demographic variables.

For the women, there were no significant correlations between demographics and DRF accuracy scores at the .01 level, but there was a significant positive correlation between female DRF 4 scores and level of education, the higher the education the higher the score, at the .05 level.

2.5.3 Reliability analysis

Reliability analysis was conducted on the male and female Dyadic Reflective Function Scores, respectively, using Cronbach's alpha. The score for the set of male correlations was .5311 for an N of 20. The score for the set of female correlations was .7512 for an N of 20. These scores should be understood in the context of a small subject sample.

2.5.4 Validating criteria

In the research that has previously been conducted on reflective function with respect to caregiver-child relationships using the Adult Attachment Interview and the Reflective Function Scale, attachment security was found to be the most significant predictor of reflective function. In the present study, attachment style was measured using the revised Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (Fraley et al., 2000) along two dimensions, anxiety and avoidance. The correlations between subjects' anxiety and avoidant attachment scores and dyadic reflective function scores are shown in table 2.5:

Table 2.5: Spearman's correlation coefficients for combined male and female DRF scores and male and female attachment style anxiety and avoidance scores

	Anxiety (Male)	Avoidance (Male)	Anxiety (Female)	Avoidance (Female)
P2 v P1(P2)	-.235	-.126	-.106	-.234
P2(P1) v P1 (P2 (P1))	-.464*	-.295	-.140	-.137
P2 (P1 (P2)) v P1(P2(P1(P2)))	-.043	.148	.234	-.178
P1 v P2 (P1) (How he/she was v How he/she thinks he/she said he/she was)	-.260	-.185	-.167	-.119
P1 v P2 (P1) (How he/she acted v How he/she thinks he/she said he/she acted	-.492*	-.210	-.093	-.400
Global Ind. Score	-.504*	-.220	-.074	-.305

* Correlation significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
* Correlation significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

The six sets of correlations are represented in the same manner as they were in the previous analyses except both men and women are assumed to be P1 on this table because their DRF scores were combined for the analysis.

For the men, there were three significant negative correlations between the dyadic reflective function scores and anxiety. The low number of subjects should always be kept in mind with respect to the statistical power, but the fact that there is a trend for negative correlations between performance on the DRFQ and attachment

insecurity provides support for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between reflective capacity and attachment security.

Though there were no significant correlations for the women, there were mostly negative correlations between attachment insecurity and performance on the DRFQ.

2.6 Discussion

The results of the pilot study indicate that the DRFQ is reflecting performance differences with respect to attachment styles. The negative correlations between dyadic reflective function scores and attachment insecurity demonstrate this inverse relationship. The significant negative correlations for the male population (n=20) between attachment anxiety and the dyadic reflective function scores could be indicative of the tendency towards projection that might occur in an anxiously attached individual in a vulnerable situation. The lower dyadic reflective function scores reflect a lower ability to reflect on the situation from different perspectives. It will be interesting to see how this plays out in a bigger sample, when the statistical analyses become more powerful, especially since findings in the empathic accuracy literature have reflected more accuracy for anxiously attached individuals. The emphasis in this pilot study was not to look for significant correlations as much as it was to identify trends, and to explore the relationship between DRF scores and attachment style scores.

In terms of the demographics, no significant differences were found between men and women in their respective performances on the measure. Level of education was correlated with one of the dyadic reflective function categories for the female population, but considering that 60% of the women had only completed secondary

education, it is difficult to draw conclusions from this given the size of the sample. It is something that will need to be investigated further in the larger study though it does reflect findings by Thomas et al. (1997) that were discussed in chapter one that more highly educated partners have been found to demonstrate greater empathic accuracy. To reiterate, the authors hypothesized that better educated people might produce greater empathic accuracy scores because better educated people might be smarter and more able to use information and make empathic judgments, and they may be more motivated to concentrate on "problem-solving" discussion (Thomas et al., 1997).

For the purposes of the pilot study, demographics, attachment style and dyadic reflective function measures were assessed, mainly to validate the performance of the DRFQ. The almost 100 couples that participated in the larger study, which will be discussed in chapter four, completed measures for marital satisfaction, interpersonal problems, symptomatology, introversion/extraversion and psychological mindedness for the purposes of assessing discriminant validity of the DRFQ and exploring in more depth relationships between dyadic reflective function and attachment style, relationship satisfaction and other variables.

In the following chapter, test-retest reliability of the DRFQ is assessed with a random sample of eighteen couples at a one-year interval, the primary purpose of which is to identify the most reliable scoring method of the DRFQ.

CHAPTER 3. TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY OF THE DRFQ

3.1 Introduction

The main purpose of the current chapter is to assess the stability of the scoring system of the DRFQ where inter-subject accuracy scores and factor difference scores are assessed via fisher transformations, intra class correlations, absolute difference scores, t-tests and t-values. This is an essential measure of reliability because if there was large variability at different points in time, this would have obvious implications for the interpretability of the measure.

Test-retest was assessed with a one-year gap between test and retest. The test-retest interval was so substantial in order to eliminate the possibility that participants would remember how they responded the first time around. If only two weeks were left between test and retest, the reliability of the scores would have easily been confounded with a test of memory, which obviously would not have provided accurate insight into the reliability of the questionnaire.

In order to assess the stability of the DRFQ over time, test-retest reliability was conducted with a random sample of the couples that originally participated in the main study (n=18 couples), approximately 20% of the original sample. Due to the amount of time that elapsed between test and retest, and the fact that relationships are dynamic and inevitably change over time, it was expected that couples would fluctuate to a certain extent in their scores, but that the reliability coefficients would be in the range of validity coefficients, between .5 and .6, depending on the score that was being tested. It is generally accepted that there is an inverse relationship between time that elapses between tests and the reliability coefficient (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983).

3.2 Methods

3.2.1 Design

The following study is a within-subjects correlational design. The dependent variables are the five sets of scores derived from the Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire (DRF scores 1 – 5: 1st order correlation, 2nd order correlation, 3rd order correlation, how you think your partner said he/she was..., and how you think your partner said he/she acted during the disagreement) and the twelve DRF factor difference scores, which represent the four factors assessed for DRF 1, 2 and 3.

3.2.2 Settings and Apparatus

Participants who agreed to participate in the retest completed the DRFQ in various café locations in London.

3.2.3 Procedure

All of the original participants were emailed at random and asked if they would be willing to participate in a short follow-up test where they would have to complete one of the questionnaires they completed originally at time one.

One of the stipulations of study participation, as in the original study, was that it was necessary for both members of the couple to participate. Couples who agreed to participate were given the same version of the DRFQ that they completed originally. It was emphasised, as in the original study that the most important consideration was that they were thinking about the same issue and the same time that they disagreed upon the issue that they jointly selected. Couples were instructed to think about the same issue that they chose at time one.

Participants were then instructed to sit separately to complete the questionnaires and to come to the primary investigator with any questions.

3.2.4 Subjects

Eighteen of the original ninety-six dating, co-habiting and/or married couples that participated in the main study participated in the retest. All of the couples that participated at time one were contacted at random via email. The eighteen couples included in the present study were the first to respond that they were willing to participate.

Couples were told that the retest would take approximately half-an-hour to complete. No compensation was offered. There were no couples that dropped out before completing, or during completion of the study.

3.2.5 Materials

Couples were given male and female versions of the DRFQ to complete thinking about the same issue that they selected at time one.

3.3 Results

3.3.1 Test-retest reliability

Retest data for 36 male and female participants for their five DRF scores plus a global score, which is an average of the five scores is represented in table 3.1. Retest data for the twelve factor difference scores, four each from DRF 1 – 3, derived from the adjective scales is represented in table 3.2 (the factor analysis of the adjective scales is discussed in detail in the following chapter). Subjects were aggregated across gender, which is why there are retest scores for 36 subjects as opposed to for 18 couples, so that, for example, there is no differentiation between male DRF 1 and female DRF 1.

The first column in the respective tables represents the number of items in each subsection of the DRFQ where the respective scores are derived from. The second

column contains retest scores for Fisher transformations between participants. The third column contains intra class correlation scores (ICCs) between participants. The fourth column contains t-values. The fifth contains t-tests and the sixth column, absolute difference scores. These represent the various ways to measure the relationship between individuals within the couple.

The Pearson's correlation coefficients listed in tables 3.1 and 3.2 below were generated from DRFQ data on a sample of 18 male and 18 female subjects tested after a one-year interval. This might appear a bit confusing because there are two different correlation scores that are being discussed here. One pertains to the test-retest reliability coefficient and the other pertains to the correlation between male and female responses on the DRFQ.

The highest retest scores overall for the respective DRF scores and the DRF factor difference scores were using Fisher's to compare participants' scores, though it appears that the test-retest reliability for the ICCs was quite similar. The reason that there are no ICC retest scores for DRF 4 & 5 is because ICCs were not run for these scores. They were only run for DRF scores 1 – 3, the scores based on the four adjective subsections.

The scores with the lowest test-retest reliability for the DRF scores were the t-value and t-test scores ranging from -.31 for DRF 3 to .12 for DRF 5 for the t-value scores and from -.27 for DRF 3 to .18 for DRF 4 for the t-test scores.

Table 3.1: Test-retest reliability. Pearson's correlation coefficients for the five male-female combined DRF correlation scores plus a sixth global score, which represents an average of the five DRF scores

Variable	Number of items	Fisher (N=36)	ICC (N=36)	T-value (N=36)	T-test (N=36)	Absolute difference (N=36)
DRF 1	19	.54	.40	-.25	.07	.48
DRF 2	19	.50	.58	-.12	-.13	.36
DRF 3	19	.53	.42	-.31	-.27	.53
DRF 4	14	.48	--	-.09	.18	.05
DRF 5	15	.46	--	.12	.09	.12
Global	--	.60	--	--	--	.65

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

The highest retest scores overall for the respective DRF factor difference scores were using Fisher's to compare participants' scores, though as was the case for the individual DRF scores, it appears that the test-retest reliability for the ICC's was quite similar.

The scores with the lowest test-retest reliability for the DRF factor difference scores were the t-value and t-test scores, which is reflective of the results for the individual DRF scores.

Table 3.2: Test-retest reliability. Pearson's correlation coefficients for the twelve male-female combined DRF factor difference scores, four each for DRF 1 - 3

Variable	Number of items per factor	Fisher (N=36)	ICC (N=36)	T-value (N=36)	T-test (N=36)	Absolute difference (N=36)
DRF 1, Factor 1	5	.63	.51	.16	.23	.55
DRF 1, Factor 2	5	.56	.53	.07	.11	.47
DRF 1, Factor 3	3	.52	.45	-.16	.21	.44
DRF 1, Factor 4	4	.48	.49	-.23	.06	.26
DRF 2, Factor 1	5	.67	.59	-.12	.39	.60
DRF 2, Factor 2	5	.60	.61	.11	.14	.42
DRF 2, Factor 3	3	.50	.43	-.23	-.08	.49
DRF 2, Factor 4	4	.53	.41	-.30	.05	.31
DRF 3, Factor 1	5	.52	.52	-.21	.12	.26
DRF 3, Factor 2	5	.54	.47	-.01	-.07	.37
DRF 3, Factor 3	3	.46	.39	-.34	.07	.19
DRF 3, Factor 4	4	.42	.41	-.27	-.21	.08

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

3.3.2 Gender comparison of test-retest reliability

When men and women were analysed separately regarding their test-retest reliability scores, there were no significant differences between their scores for the Fishers, ICCs, t-values, or t-test scores (see **appendix 3.1**). There was however a significant difference between male and female test-retest reliability scores for the absolute difference scores ($U = 5.50$, $N^1 = 6$, $N^2 = 6$, $p = .041$, two-tailed).

3.4 Discussion

3.4.1 Review of stability of the DRFQ scores

It is given that certain constructs would be expected to have higher test-retest reliability such as IQ, whereas mood related concepts would tend to fluctuate more, which would be reflected in lower test-retest coefficients. Dyadic reflective functioning would probably lie somewhere in the middle of this spectrum, toward the more dynamic end. Reflective functioning has been posited to be situation and relationship specific (Fonagy et al., 1998). It is a dynamic construct that would naturally differ in different contexts. But it is not something as fickle as a mood that rushes in and rushes out again. Dyadic reflective functioning is posited to be rooted in development, more specifically, in one's attachment security with the primary caregiver. This does not mean that one's reflective capacity is fixed in stone, because relationships and relationship satisfaction invariably change over time, but it does mean that there is a developmental trajectory for one's capacity for dyadic reflective functioning, which contributes to its stability and trait-like characteristics.

In order to account for the somewhat transient nature of dyadic reflective functioning, it was important to maintain relationship specificity, i.e. measuring DRF in the same relationship over time, and situation specificity, i.e. thinking about the same issue of disagreement in time 1 and time 2. Another factor in measuring DRF was the triggering of the attachment system by having the couples concentrate on an issue of disagreement between them. Kline (1999), in discussing the dynamics of measuring test-retest reliability, emphasised that "to measure the test-retest reliability of a transient variable...we would have to attempt to arouse fear or anger on both occasions" (8).

Finally, it is inevitable that in multiple-choice questionnaires such as the DRFQ, a certain degree of haphazard responding, or random answering will be involved. This is only somewhat preventable by making the instructions as clear as possible, not over-burdening participants with too many questions and being present with the couples to encourage them and answer any questions they have. It is also somewhat controllable with respect to the number of items that are used. The more items that are used, the less impact guessing has on the reliability of the measure (Viswanathan, 2005).

3.4.2 Correlation vs. difference scores

The main aim of the test-retest reliability study was to help identify which method of scoring the DRFQ was most reliable: measuring correlations between participants (i.e. fisher or ICC correlation between what men said they felt vs. what women thought men felt) and/or measuring differences between participants (i.e. t-value, t-test, or absolute difference between what men said they felt vs. what women thought men felt). If both correlation scores and absolute difference scores had strong reliability, it might have made sense to utilize both sets of scores. It turns out that, for the most part, the correlation scores were more reliable than the absolute difference scores, which were in turn more stable than the t-value and t-test scores. This was true both for the individual DRF scores and for the DRF factor difference scores.

The main reason that difference scores were used was essentially to check the correlation scores because although the correlation scores were employed to measure the accuracy of prediction, correlation scores are measuring patterns. It is possible, for example, that most times that the man said he felt something a little bit that the woman thought he felt quite a bit, or one said moderately and the other extremely. The chances of that pattern continuing throughout are slim, but it would result in a

high correlation and a false positive of sorts. One of the purposes of using difference scores was to see what the relationship was between the correlation and the absolute difference. If there was a significant positive correlation and a significant positive absolute difference score, this is an indication that this false positive is at work. It turns out that this did not occur. So although the difference scores will not be employed as reliable gauges of accuracy, they are helpful in checking the correlation scores.

As aforementioned, there is an inverse relationship between the time that elapses between test and re-test and reliability scores. In the present study, one year elapsed between test and re-test. This is a long time to elapse for such a dynamic construct that is posited to be situation specific. The fact that the reliability scores were in the .5 to .6 range, which would be considered fairly low if there was a two-week lapse between test and re-test, demonstrates quite a bit of stability in dyadic reflective functioning over time and is quite encouraging regarding the usefulness of the instrument. As aforementioned, it would have been possible to have conducted the test-retest with a much smaller time interval, which could have very possibly resulted in even higher test-retest coefficients, but this would have been misleading and very probably would have been confounded with memory.

In the following chapter, a sample of 96 couples completed the DRFQ as well as a battery of other measures, which were mentioned in previous chapters. Discriminant and concurrent validity of the DRFQ is assessed. A principal component analysis of the feeling adjectives, which comprise DRF scores 1 – 3, is conducted, and the importance of taking into account projection and/or attribution in addition to accuracy is demonstrated via the analysis of DRF projection alongside

measures of relationship satisfaction and attachment style in addition to other variables.

CHAPTER 4. APPLICATION OF THE DYADIC REFLECTIVE FUNCTIONING QUESTIONNAIRE (DRFQ)

4.1 Introduction

The DRFQ was constructed in order to adapt an important attachment related concept to couple relationships, a concept that had previously only been applied in the context of the child-caregiver relationships via the Reflective Function Scale (Fonagy et al., 1998). The importance of the concept of reflective function has been elucidated in chapter one both in terms of its investigative and clinical relevance. It was the apparent absence of a measure that is both rooted in development and relatively easy and inexpensive to apply that formed the basis for this work.

An important factor in the development of the DRFQ is its practicality. Another motivating factor behind its development was the time and money that is required to implement interviews such as the AAI, including the time it takes to transcribe the interview and code it. A self-report measure cannot replace the richness of material one gets from an interview or a video-taped session, but self-report measures do have an important place in process and outcome research.

The DRFQ was developed with the Reflective Function Scale as its theoretical foundation, but there were inevitably certain shifts that were necessary apart from the fact that it is a self-report measure. The main shift was the focus from the caregiver to the reciprocal adult couple relationship. That implied placing equal focus on both members of the couple. Using one's partner's scores to validate or essentially create the other partner's scores served to greatly reduce the possibility of social response bias that is an inevitable caveat in many self-report measures.

The piloting of the DRFQ that was reviewed in chapter 2 revealed some significant negative correlations between attachment style anxiety and avoidance and

DRF accuracy scores, which corresponded with the hypothesis that people with high DRF accuracy would be more securely attached. Test-retest reliability, which was reviewed in the previous chapter, revealed that individual DRF accuracy scores as well as DRF factor difference scores were stable over a one-year time period. Considering the dynamic nature of couple relationships and the length of time between test and retest, the test-retest reliability scores were quite encouraging.

Following the completion and analysis of the pilot study, a larger study was conducted with a sample of 96 couples, a sub-sample of which was undergoing psychodynamic couple therapy at London Marriage Guidance. Couples were given the DRFQ and an additional battery of measures in order to assess discriminant and concurrent validity of the DRFQ, predictive validity of the DRFQ and to explore other possible relationships.

The following hypotheses and research questions are based on related findings in the reflective function literature and empathic accuracy literature, which were discussed in the literature review, as well as results from the pilot study:

1) There will be no significant relationship between level of education and DRF.
2) There will be no significant relationship between length of relationship and DRF.
3) There will not be a significant difference between men and women concerning DRF.
4) There will not be significant relationships between other variables such as age, ethnicity, marital status, children, ratings of parents' marital satisfaction, ratings of happiness of couple relationships compared to friends' relationships and self-rated IQ and DRF.
5) There will be a negative relationship between insecure attachment style and DRF accuracy.
6) Individuals with higher DRF accuracy scores and whose partners have higher DRF accuracy scores will have higher relationship satisfaction.
7) Does DRF predict variables such as interpersonal problems, psychological symptoms, attachment style and relationship satisfaction?
8) DRF is distinct from variables such as psychological mindedness and personality style.

4.2 Methods

4.2.1 Subjects

Ninety-six dating, co-habiting and/or married couples participated in the main study. Couples were recruited via various methods. Thirty-three percent of couples were friends of friends (no close friends participated in the study). Thirteen percent of couples were recruited as active clients of London Marriage Guidance. Forty-seven percent of couples were recruited via the UCL subject pool and seven percent of couples were recruited through an ad in a local North London weekly paper (see **appendix 4.1**).

Couples were instructed that the study was going to take approximately one hour to complete and each couple was given a gift voucher upon completion of the study. There were no couples that dropped out before completing, or during completion of the study. See tables 4.1a & b and table 4.2 for more detailed information on the individuals and couples that participated in the study:

Table 4.1a: Sample characteristics (By gender)

Characteristic		Male	Female
N		96	96
Age:	18-25	25%	35%
	26-35	47%	41%
	36-45	15%	17%
	45-60	9%	5%
	61+	4%	2%
Ethnicity:	White	78%	69%
	Other	22%	31%

Education Completed:		
Secondary	29%	28%
University and above	71%	72%
Married Previously:	9%	10%
Children:	27%	31%
In therapy:	19%	29%
Type of therapy:		
Individual	28%	54%
Couple	72%	46%
How long in therapy?:		
Under 1 year	72%	50%
1-2 years	16%	21%
2-3 years	6%	21%
3-4 years	0%	4%
4+ years	6%	4%

Table 4.1b: Additional sample characteristics (By gender)

Religiousness:		
Not at all	54%	47%
A little bit	24%	28%
Moderately	13%	5%
Quite a bit	7%	17%
Extremely	2%	3%
Parents marital satisfaction:		
Extremely unhappy	16%	32%
Fairly unhappy	11%	9%
A little unhappy	6%	13%
Happy	28%	17%
Very happy	16%	11%
Extremely happy	19%	11%
Perfect	5%	7%
Happiness of relationship compared to friends' relationships:		
Extremely unhappier	1%	14%
A lot unhappier	7%	8%
About the same	34%	34%
A lot happier	39%	36%
Extremely happier	19%	8%
Self-rated IQ:		
Below 85	1%	14%
86-100	6%	7%
101-115	26%	25%
116-130	45%	39%
131+	22%	15%

Table 4.2: Sample Characteristics (By couple)

Characteristic		Couple
N		96
Subject Pool:		
	Friends of friends	33%
	Couples in therapy at LMG	13%
	UCL Study Volunteers	47%
	Ad respondents	7%
Marital Status:	Dating	22%
	Married	39%
	Co-habiting, but not married	39%
How long married?:		
	Less than a year	16%
	1-5 years	51%
	6-10 years	14%
	11-20 years	3%
	21+ years	16%
Time Together:	Less than a year	10%
	1-5 years	61%
	6-10 years	17%
	11-20 years	6%
	21+ years	6%

4.2.2 Design

The present study consists of a number of analyses including correlations between DRF accuracy scores and demographic and other variables; inter-subject differences between standardized factor scores; gender differences in factor scores; DRF projection scores and other variables and DRF projection scores as predictors of DRF accuracy scores; and gender differences in DRF projection scores.

4.2.3 Settings and Apparatus

Couples who agreed to participate in the study agreed upon an appointment time to meet with the primary investigator. The meetings took place in various cafes throughout Central London. The couples sat together to review the instructions, sign consent forms and to ask questions. Then they jointly selected the issue that they were going to think about while completing the DRFQ and moved to separate tables to complete the questionnaires. The primary investigator stayed at a third table in case the participants had any questions or concerns.

The following is a summary of the measures used in the study in addition to the DRFQ with details concerning validity and reliability (see **appendices 2.3a – f**).

4.2.3.1 The Abbreviated Dyadic Adjustment Scale (ADAS)

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) was developed by Spanier (1976) in order to assess the quality of marriages and other dyadic relationships. The original scale contains 32 items. Via component analytic studies, Spanier concluded that there are four components of dyadic adjustment that can be used as subscales: dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus and affectional expression. Spanier and Cole (1974) cited over 300 studies that used marital adjustment as their dependent variable and emphasized the need for an adequate measure dyadic adjustment in the field.

Spanier emphasized that marital or dyadic adjustment should be understood as a dynamic process that can change over time. Though cross-sectional studies of dyadic adjustment are useful, the questionnaire can be considered to be a snapshot of dyadic adjustment at a given point in time (Spanier, 1976). Spanier and Cole (1974) understood dyadic adjustment to be a process whose outcome can be predicted by certain variables. The variables that they hypothesized as being useful predictors are: (1) troublesome dyadic differences; (2) interpersonal tensions and personal anxiety; (3) dyadic satisfaction; (4) dyadic cohesion; and (5) consensus on matters of importance to dyadic functioning.

In developing the DAS, all items that had ever been used in any scale measuring dyadic adjustment were identified and pooled into a group of approximately 300 items (Spanier, 1976). Duplicate items were eliminated and content validity reduced the number to approximately 200 items. Some new items were included as well and a first draft of the questionnaire was given to a sample of

over two hundred people. All items with low variance and high skewness were eliminated. Remaining items were assessed for wording and significant differences between them and thirty-two items remained. Content, criterion-related and construct validity were demonstrated as well as internal reliability using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha (Cronbach, 1951). The total scale reliability was .96.

Nine years following the development of Spanier's (1976) 32-item Dyadic Adjustment Scale, Sharpley and Rogers (1984) proposed an abbreviated version of the measure, which was suggested to be nearly as accurate as the original scale (see **appendix 2.3b**). In an earlier study conducted by Sharpley and Cross (1982), the authors conducted a psychometric analysis of Spanier's DAS (1976) and concluded that six items which correctly classified 92% of the respondents in their study, plus a global item, which alone correctly classified 65% of respondents, could be useful in assessing dyadic adjustment while being much less time consuming.

The alpha reliability coefficient of the Abbreviated Dyadic Adjustment Scale (ADAS) was .76, which is not as high as the .96 of the original DAS, but it is considered acceptable for an abbreviated screening test (Anastasi, 1982). The seven items in the ADAS had a corrected item-total correlation of .57 or greater and the range in inter-item correlations from .34 to .71 demonstrated that none of the items overlapped and they were all useful in the ADAS (Sharpley & Rogers, 1984).

Hunsley et al. (1995) conducted a study to determine whether any of the various proposed short-form versions of the DAS, including the seven-item ADAS used in the present study, could serve as a substitute for the original DAS without compromising the construct validity of the DAS. Analyses of internal consistency, corrected item-total correlations, and comparisons of correlations between the full-scale and the short forms with conceptually relevant constructs that were used in

assessing the DAS such as marital satisfaction, dysfunctional relationship beliefs and communication were conducted (235). The authors concluded that the "seven-item version proposed by Sharpley and Rogers (1984) has the potential to be used as a short form substitute for the DAS" (235).

4.2.3.2 The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) was developed from a longer psychological self-report called the SCL-90-R (Derogatis, 1975). The BSI is a 53-item self-report symptom inventory that was designed to assess the psychological symptom status of psychiatric and medical patients as well as people who are not patients (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983) (see **appendix 2.3f**). The dimensions in the BSI are supposed to reflect the nine primary symptom dimensions of the SCL-90-R. In addition to the nine primary symptom dimensions, there are three global indices of distress in the BSI: the General Severity Index (GSI), the Positive Symptom Distress Index (PSDI), and the Positive Symptom Total (PST). These three global measures are also utilized by the SCL-90-R, each of which express psychological distress in a different way (Derogatis, Yevzeroff, & Wittelsberger, 1975).

The nine primary symptoms that are measured by the BSI are: (1) Somatization (SOM), which reflects psychological distress connected with bodily dysfunction; (2) Obsessive-compulsive (O-C), reflecting thoughts and actions that feel alien and uncontrollable; (3) Interpersonal Sensitivity (I-S), feelings of personal inadequacy and inferiority; (4) Depression (DEP); (5) Anxiety (ANX); (6) Hostility (HOS), in thoughts, feelings and actions; (7) Phobic Anxiety (PHOB), agoraphobia; (8) Paranoid Ideation (PAR), a paranoid mode of thinking; (9) Psychoticism (PSY), a continuum from mildly psychotic to extreme psychosis. There are four items in the BSI that do not fit into one of these nine categories (Boulet & Boss, 1991).

There are three global indices of distress, which were enumerated earlier. The function of each of these indices is to indicate in a single score the depth of symptomatic distress experienced by an individual (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983). The General Severity Index (GSI) is generally what is used if a single score is required to encapsulate an individual's psychological state. This is the score that is used in the present study. The Positive Symptom Distress Index (PSDI) is a measure of intensity and the Positive Symptom Total (PST) is a count of the symptoms, which the individual reports experiencing to any degree.

The BSI is designed for interpretation on three distinct, but related levels (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983): One should first look at the global indices to get a more general idea of distress. Then one should focus more specifically on the nine primary symptom dimensions, which give more of an idea of the specific areas of psychopathology. Finally, the discrete symptoms, which are represented by the items that could not be grouped into one of the nine primary symptoms, provide an even more detailed analysis of the individual's symptomatology.

The authors concluded that psychometric evaluation of the BSI revealed it to be an acceptable short version of the SCL-90-R. Test-retest at a two-week interval ranged from .68 (somatization) to .91 (phobic anxiety) for the nine primary symptoms and internal consistency reliabilities were very good for the primary symptom dimensions, ranging from Cronbach's alphas of .71 (psychoticism) to .85 (depression). The correlations of the BSI with similar dimensions in the SCL-90-R were also high (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983). Good convergence validity was also demonstrated with like dimensions of the MMPI and component analytic studies of the internal structure of the scale demonstrated evidence of construct validity (Kellett, Beail, Newman, & Hawes, 2004). A number of criterion-oriented validity and

predictive validity studies have also been completed with the BSI (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983).

4.2.3.3 The Inventory of Interpersonal Problems-Circumplex (IIP-C)

The original Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP) was developed as a result of a research program, the aim of which was to identify and assess interpersonal problems (Horowitz, 1979). Interpersonal issues were agreed upon by a number of judges based on interviews of patients who were seeking psychotherapy. A total of 127 statements, embodying a wide range of interpersonal problems, were agreed upon. These items make up the original version of the IIP (Horowitz, 1979).

The general consensus amongst interpersonal theorists is that the most appropriate way to represent interpersonal attributes is via a two-dimensional circumplex, where variables are ordered in a circular arrangement around the orthogonal dimensions of dominance versus submission and nurturance versus hostility (Alden et al., 1990).

The aim of the circumplex model of the IIP was to see whether meaningful circumplex scales could be derived from the interpersonal problems identified by Horowitz and his colleagues in the original IIP. A large component was extracted in a principal components analysis, which pointed to the fact that people have different ways of endorsing complaints (Horowitz, Rosenberg, Baer, Ureno, & Villasenor, 1988). In order to control for this general individual difference, individual item scores were ipsatized by expressing each score as a deviation from the individual's mean score across all items (Cronbach, 1949). This procedure has been demonstrated to greatly improve circumplex properties when the transformed data are subjected to principal components analyses (Alden et al., 1990). It is the main interpersonal problem score that is utilized in the present study.

Eight scales with eight items each emerged from the circumplex analysis of the IIP: Domineering (PA), items relating to overly-dominant behaviour; Vindictive scale (BC), items relating to spitefulness and distrust; Cold (DE), inability to express affection and love; Socially Avoidant (FG), anxiety and embarrassment in the presence of others; Non-assertive (HI), difficulty making needs known to others; Exploitable (JK), difficulty feeling and expressing anger towards others; Overly Nurturant (LM), try too hard to please others; and, Intrusive (NO), inappropriately self-disclosing and attention-seeking (Alden et al., 1990).

Data from studies has demonstrated that these scales display adequate internal consistency and stability across samples (Alden et al., 1990) The IIP circumplex model had a strong convergent validity with the IAS-R, which is a measure of interpersonal dispositions (Alden et al., 1990). Finally, the authors of the IIP circumplex model argue that the eight-octant scales of interpersonal problems allow for a much more comprehensive analysis than do single-item measures (Alden et al., 1990) (see **appendix 2.3d**).

4.2.3.4 The Psychological Mindedness Scale (PMS)

Psychological mindedness has been defined as: "A person's ability to see relationships among thoughts, feelings, and actions, with the goal of learning the meanings and causes of his experience and behaviour" (Applebaum, 1973). The Psychological Mindedness Scale (PMS) is a 45-item scale that was originally developed to assess individuals' suitability for psychodynamic psychotherapy (Conte, Plutchik, Jung, & Picard, 1990) (see **appendix 2.3c**). Items are rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. Higher scores indicate higher psychological mindedness.

In a preliminary report on the PMS (Conte et al., 1990), good internal reliability was reported (coefficient a = .86) as well as specific predictive validity in terms of psychotherapy outcome with psychiatric patients. In a later study (Conte, Ratto, & Karasu, 1996) the alpha coefficient was replicated at .87 for the scale.

Psychological mindedness has also been positively correlated with how many sessions a patient will attend (Conte et al., 1990) and with specific adaptive aspects of ego functioning (Conte, Buckley, Picard, & Karasu, 1995). Psychological mindedness has also been positively correlated with treatment outcome with day-treatment patients (McCallum & Piper, 1997) and with a subjective feeling of well-being and self-consciousness in non-patients (Trudeau & Reich, 1995). In another study (Beitel & Cecero, 2003), openness to experience was found to be the best predictor of psychological mindedness, where the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) was administered to subjects as well as a measure of attachment security (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) In another study, psychological mindedness was assessed alongside cognitive style (Beitel, Ferrer, & Cecero, 2004). The authors suggested that people who are higher in psychological mindedness have a cognitive profile that includes flexibility, a sense of personal agency and more of a propensity towards realistic thinking, all components, which would be likely to influence outcome in psychotherapy.

Psychological mindedness, in certain studies, has been found to differ according to demographics such as gender (Shill & Lumley, 2002) and field of study (Trudeau & Reich, 1995).

4.2.3.5 The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire - Revised Short Scale (EPQ-R S)

The revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire – Short Scale (EPQ-R S) is a 48-item self-report questionnaire that was developed in order to assess three dimensions of personality: Neuroticism (stability/emotionality), Extraversion (extraversion/introversion) and Psychoticism for people between the ages of 16 and 70 (see **appendix 2.3e**). There is a fourth scale called the Lie scale, which assesses how truthful one is being in their self-report (Alexopoulos & Kalaitzidis, 2004).

Eysenck (1947, 1952, 1967) used factor analysis to develop his theory of personality, whereby two dimensions were established, neuroticism and extraversion-introversion. Later, a psychoticism scale was developed as well as a lie scale. The EPQ-R Short Scale (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991) is a short version of the EPQ-R. The EPQ-R is a hybrid development of the Maudsley Medical Questionnaire (MMQ) (Eysenck, 1952), the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI) (Eysenck, 1959), the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964), and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ-A) (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975).

Mean scores of each dimension of the EPQ-R Short Scale range from 4.48 to 8.27 for E, from 2.42 to 7.03 for N, from 3.73 to 6.12 for L, and from 1.48 to 3.81 for P for men, women and total sample (Aluja, Garcia, & Garcia, 2002a, 2002b, July; Hosokawa & Ohyama, 1993; Katz & Francis, 2000; Wilson & Doolabh, 1992).

It has been demonstrated in a number of studies that the E and N scales had good internal consistency reliabilities ranging from 0.78 to 0.87 and from 0.74 to 0.87, respectively (Aluja et al., 2002a; Francis, Brown, & Philipchalk, 1992; Francis & Pearson, 1988; Hosokawa & Ohyama, 1993; Katz & Francis, 2000). The Lie scale had lower reliabilities ranging from 0.65 to 0.73 for the aforementioned studies. The P scale had the lowest reliability, ranging from 0.31 to 0.63.

Test-retest reliabilities for the EPQ-R Short Scale have been reported in one study as .69 for the E scale, .85 for the N scale, .79 for L, and .70 for P (Hosokawa & Ohyama, 1993).

The concurrent validity of the EPQ-R Short Scale appears to be satisfactory in different studies with the E, N, and L scales ranging from .59 to .95, from .62 to .95, and from .60 to .93, respectively (Aluja et al., 2002a; Francis et al., 1992; Francis & Pearson, 1988; Hosokawa & Ohyama, 1993; Katz & Francis, 2000; Wilson & Doolabh, 1992), when correlated with other scales of Eysenck and Eysenck (MPI, EPI, EPQ, EPQ-R). The concurrent validity of the P scale was much lower, ranging from .31 to .63.

The componential validity of the EPQ-R Short Scale was supported by four studies, which assessed the factor structure of the test (Aluja et al., 2002b, July; Francis, Lewis, & Ziebertz, 2002; Hosokawa & Ohyama, 1993; Wilson & Doolabh, 1992).

4.2.3.6 Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire – Revised (ECR-R)

A wide variety of attachment-style questionnaires have been developed since the original category models (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). More recent attachment-style questionnaires have focused on two main dimensions of attachment insecurity, anxiety and avoidance (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; Fraley et al., 2000; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). The temporal instability of attachment-style self-report measures has been documented as an issue with the reliability of such measures (Sibley & Liu, 2004), evidenced by poor test-retest reliability scores. The issue of temporal instability has inspired a debate in the field concerning the dynamic nature of attachment, that it may change over short

periods of time versus those who agree that attachment style can change, but over more prolonged periods (Sibley & Liu, 2004).

In an attempt to provide a more reliable and temporally stable measure of attachment style, Fraley et al. (2000) developed the Revised Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR-R), which was developed from a comprehensive set of over 300 items collected previously (Brennan et al., 1998) (see **appendix 2.3a**). Exploratory factor analysis led to the development of a scale with two main clusters consisting of anxiety and avoidance items respectively.

Simulation analyses were used to test the stability of the measure (Fraley et al., 2000) estimating a shared variance in repeated measures of both anxiety and avoidance dimensions to be approximately 90%, which suggested that the temporal stability of the measure was not biased by its lack of precision (Sibley & Liu, 2004).

In a study examining the validity and reliability of the ECR-R (Sibley & Liu, 2004), it was found that there was high internal reliability in both the anxiety and avoidance subscales (Cronbach's alpha = .9477 and .9344 respectively). The ECR and the ECR-R have been used in many studies since 1998 and have been found to be highly reliable and to have high construct and predictive validity (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002).

4.2.4 Procedure

Prospective participants who were either friends of friends, ad respondents, London Marriage Guidance clients, or University College London subject pool volunteers either emailed or called the primary investigator to express interest in participating in the study. The primary investigator then emailed the prospective participants, attaching either an information sheet for the general population (see **appendix 4.2a**), or an information sheet for clients of London Marriage Guidance

(see **appendix 4.2b**). Couples were asked to read the information sheet and respond with any questions and, if they wished, to set up a time to meet.

If prospective participants did not respond within one week after they were mailed the information sheet, they were contacted again to ask them if they had the chance to read the information sheet and if they were interested in participating in the study. If they did not respond after this reminder, they were not contacted again. Those who responded with questions were responded to with answers, and those who responded expressing interest in participating in the study were given a time to meet.

One of the stipulations of study participation was that it was necessary for both members of the couple to participate. Participants met with the primary investigator once a time and place was confirmed. Couples were asked to read the instruction sheet (see **appendix 4.3**) and the information sheet once again. They were then asked if they had any questions or concerns about the study. Then both members of the couple were given consent forms to complete (see **appendix 4.4**). They were then given a list of issues that couples commonly have disagreements about, taken from the Family Behaviour Survey (FBS). As in the pilot study, participants were explained that this was a list of issues that comprise frequent topics of disagreement for many couples. They were asked to take two minutes to review the list together and to agree upon an issue that they had disagreed upon recently. It was emphasized that the most important consideration was that they were both thinking about the same issue and the same time that they disagreed upon the issue that they jointly selected. Once couples selected their issue, they were each given a packet of questionnaires. As in the pilot study, there were different questionnaires for men and for women because the DRFQ has a male and female version to minimize confusion. Participants were asked to write the number of the issue they selected on the top of the DRFQ.

Participants were then instructed to sit at separate tables to complete the questionnaires and to come to the primary investigator with any questions. The first person to complete the questionnaires was invited back to the table with the primary investigator. They were asked how they felt about the study, if they had any questions or concerns, or additional feedback. The same procedure was followed when the second member of the couple completed his/her questionnaires. Finally, couples were reunited and asked again how they were feeling; how they found the questionnaires, and if they had any questions or concerns. They were asked if they minded being contacted for follow-up and finally they were given a gift voucher for participating in the study and asked to sign a form confirming that they received the money.

4.3 Construct Validity

A principal component analysis was conducted on the four adjective scales (1st order - on self, 2nd order – self on other, 3rd order – self on other on self, 4th order – self on other on self on other) in order to determine the structure of the DRFQ (see **table 4.3**). Items with loadings less than .3 and/or greater than -.3 were not included in the table. Items in boldface are the items that comprise the respective components.

Four components emerged for the adjective scales. Each component had an eigenvalue of greater than one. The four components for the four adjective scales are labelled, respectively:

Component 1 - 'Avoidant'
Component 2 - 'Optimistic'
Component 3 - 'Annoyed & Frustrated'
Component 4 - 'Anxious'

Details of the components for each of the adjective scales follow:

The four rotated components of the adjective scales explained 53.09% of the total variance. Component 1, 'Avoidant', accounted for 21.60% of the common variance after rotation. It is composed of five items (distracted, bored, detached, tired and headachey or ill). All of the items have loadings greater than .5.

Component 2, 'Optimistic', accounted for 13.86% of the common variance after rotation. It is comprised of five items (optimistic, thoughtful, effective, sympathetic and interested). All of the items have loadings greater than .5.

Component 3, 'Annoyed & Frustrated', accounted for 9.9% of the common variance after rotation. It is comprised of three items (annoyed, frustrated and demanding). All of the items have loadings greater than .6.

Component 4, 'Anxious', accounted for 7.74% of the common variance after rotation. It is comprised of four items (unsure, apprehensive, *not* confident and perplexed). All of the items have loadings greater than .4.

Table 4.3: Varimax rotated principal component analysis for each of the 19 items of adjective scales 1-4 combined

	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4
Distracted	**.719**	--	--	--
Bored	**.684**	--	--	--
Detached	**.683**	--	--	--
Tired	**.624**	--	--	--
Headachey or ill	**.570**	--	--	--
Optimistic	--	**.666**	--	--
Thoughtful	--	**.662**	--	.310
Effective	--	**.662**	--	--
Sympathetic	--	**.637**	-.343	--
Interested	-.473	**.589**	--	--
Involved	-.345	.541	.430	--
Alert	-.402	.454	.352	--
Annoyed	--	--	**.761**	--
Frustrated	--	--	**.698**	--
Demanding	--	--	**.678**	--
Unsure	--	--	--	**.728**
Apprehensive	--	--	--	**.693**
Confident	--	.430	--	**-.677**
Perplexed	.385	--	--	**.435**

- **Values smaller than .3 and/or less than -.3 are not shown in the table**

4.4 Reliability

4.4.1 Internal Consistency

The internal consistency reliabilities, Cronbach's alphas (Cronbach, 1951) for each of the four components detracted from the adjective scales are located in table 4.4:

Table 4.4: Internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) for the components for all of the scales

Reliability (internal consistency) of components	
Scales 1-4	Reliability (internal consistency)
Component 1 (Avoidant)	.73
Component 2 (Optimistic)	.72
Component 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated)	.65
Component 4 (Anxious)	.64

4.4.2 Inter-component correlations

Inter-component correlations for male and female subjects were conducted to assess the relationship between the four components (see **table 4.5**). There was a significant negative correlation between component 1 (Avoidant) and component 2 (Optimistic), r = -.317, p = .000. There was a significant correlation between component 1 (Avoidant) and component 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated), r = .228, p = .000. There was a significant correlation between component 1 (Avoidant) and component 4 (Anxious), r = .355, p = .000. There was a significant negative correlation between component 2 (Optimistic) and component 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated), r = -.182, p = .000. There was a significant negative correlation between component 2 (Optimistic) and component 4 (Anxious), r = -.078, p = .031. There was a significant correlation between component 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) and component 4 (Anxious), r = .243, p = .000:

Table 4.5: Inter-component correlations

Inter-component correlations (Pearson's r) for male and female subjects		
Components	Pearson's correlation coefficient	Significance
Component 1 (Avoidant) and Component 2 (Optimistic)	-.317**	.000
Component 1 (Avoidant) and Component 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated)	.228**	.000
Component 1 (Avoidant) and Component 4 (Anxious)	.355**	.000
Component 2 (Optimistic) and Component 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated)	-.182**	.000
Component 2 (Optimistic) and Component 4 (Anxious)	-.078*	.031
Component 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) and Component 4 (Anxious)	.243**	.000

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

4.5 Results

4.5.1 Correlations between DRF accuracy scores and demographic variables

4.5.1.1 Male on self & Female on self

The following is an analysis of how both men and women, respectively, responded about how they felt during the disagreement that they jointly selected on the DRFQ. Their responses were assessed alongside certain demographic variables. Due to the large amount of correlations, significance equal to, or less than .01 will be discussed throughout the analysis.

There were no significant correlations or differences between the following demographic variables and how participants responded about themselves on the DRFQ: religiousness (see **appendix 4.5.1**), parents' marital satisfaction (see **appendix 4.5.2**), education (see **appendix 4.5.3**), marital status (see **appendix 4.5.4**), how long together (see **appendix 4.5.5**), therapy (see **appendix 4.5.6**) and ethnicity (see **appendix 4.5.7**).

Age

It appears that the older the men, the more negative they were about how they felt during the disagreement, Rho (96) = -.329, p = .001.

Interestingly, the same held true for women's ages and how men reported about themselves, but not for how women reported about themselves. It appears that the older the women, the more negative the men felt about themselves during the disagreement, Rho (96) = -.332, p = .001.

This could be interpreted in a number of ways: 1) Men become more negative about their feelings as they get older, while women are more positive. 2) Men are more realistic about their feelings as they get older, while women are more idealistic.

However one chooses to interpret the "negative" adjectives, it is an interesting difference to keep in mind.

Table 4.5.1.1: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female age and their respective affect ratings concerning how each felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	-.329**	.001	-.332**	.001
Mean female on self	-.128	.213	-.196	.056
Fisher male-female on self	.241*	.018	.247*	.015
Difference male-female on self	-.146	.156	-.100	.332

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Children

It appears that men who had children were less positive about how they felt during the disagreement, t (96) = 3.337, p = .001.

Women who had children were also less positive about how they felt during the disagreement, t (96) = 2.825, p = .006. Men whose partners had children were also less positive about how they felt during the disagreement, t (96) = 4.147, p = .000.

Table 4.5.1.2: T-value for male and female with or without children and their respective affect ratings concerning how each felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	3.337**	.001	4.147**	.000
Mean female on self	.988	.326	2.825**	.006
Fisher male-female on self	-.928	.356	-.809	.420
Difference male-female on self	1.786	.077	.724	.471

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Happiness of relationship compared to friends' relationships

It appears that the happier men rated their relationships compared to their friends' relationships, the more positive women were about how they felt during the disagreement, Rho (96) = .404, p = .001.

It is also interesting that the higher men rated their relationships compared to friends' relationships, the lower the difference between men and women in terms of how they each rated how they felt during the disagreement, Rho (96) = -.292, p = .017.

Table 4.5.1.3: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships and their respective affect ratings concerning how each felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	.190	.123	.060	.607
Mean female on self	.404**	.001	.142	.221
Fisher male-female on self	.066	.598	.041	.724
Difference male-female on self	-.292*	.017	-.059	.611

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

4.5.1.2 Male on self & Female on male

The following is an analysis of the relationship between how men reported about how they felt versus how women thought men felt during the disagreement (**DRF 1**). Demographic variables were assessed alongside to assess whether certain variables impacted the extent to which women were able to predict how their partners felt during the disagreement.

There were no significant correlations or differences between the following demographic variables and how accurately women rated men's responses (**DRF 1**) on the DRFQ: parents' marital satisfaction (see **appendix 4.5.8**), ethnicity (see **appendix 4.5.9**), education (see **appendix 4.5.10**), marital status (see **appendix 4.5.11**), religiousness (see **appendix 4.5.12**), children (see **appendix 4.5.13**), how long together (see **appendix 4.5.14**) and therapy (see **appendix 4.5.15**).

Age

It appears that the older the men, the lower the difference score was between how men reported about how they felt during the disagreement and how women thought men felt, Rho (96) = -.299, p = .003. The same held true for female age at the .05 level, Rho = -.203, p = .047.

In light of the previous finding concerning men's increasing negativity with age, it could be that they (men) were in turn more predictable due to their negativity, which contributed to the increased DRF scores for women. It is interesting to think about what effect men's increased negativity with age might have had on their DRF scores. Could it be that their negativity skewed their perceptions of their partners and that this is why their DRF scores did not improve with age, while women's did?

Table 4.5.1.4: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female age and men's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	.044	.667	-.073	.482
Fisher male on self-female on male	.055	.596	.093	.369
Difference male on self-female on male	-.299**	.003	-.203*	.047

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Happiness of relationship compared to friends' relationships

It appears that the happier men rated their relationships compared to friends' relationships, the more positive women were in rating their partners' feelings, Rho (96) = .386, p = .001.

It is also interesting that the happier men rated their relationships compared to friends' relationships, the lower the difference between how men said they felt on the DRFQ and how women thought men felt at the .05 level, Rho = -.261, p = .033.

Table 4.5.1.5: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female stated happiness of their relationships compared to friends' and men's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	.386**	.001	.004	.974
Fisher male on self-female on male	-.082	.509	-.013	.910
Difference male on self-female on male	-.261*	.033	.047	.688

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

4.5.1.3 Female on self & Male on female

The following is an analysis of the relationship between how women reported about how they felt versus how men thought women felt during the disagreement (**DRF 1**). Demographic variables were assessed alongside to ascertain whether

certain variables impacted the extent to which men were able to predict how their partners felt during the disagreement.

There were no significant correlations or differences between the following demographic variables and how accurately men rated women's responses (**DRF 1**) on the DRFQ: age (see **appendix 4.5.16**), religiousness (see **appendix 4.5.17**), children (see **appendix 4.5.18**), how long couples were together (see **appendix 4.5.19**), parents' marital satisfaction (see **appendix 4.5.20**), education (see **appendix 4.5.21**), marital status (see **appendix 4.5.22**), therapy (see **appendix 4.5.23**) and ethnicity (see **appendix 4.5.24**).

Happiness of relationship compared to friends' relationships

It appears that the higher that men rated the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, the higher the difference score between how women reported how they felt during the disagreement and how men thought women felt, Rho (96) = .353, p = .003. This is somewhat counter-intuitive and is the opposite of the result for women predicting their partners' feelings.

One reason for this could be that the ratings of the happiness of the relationship could represent both defensive idealization and genuine feelings of happiness, which could then be reflected in lower predictive abilities for the former and positively impact reflective capacity in the latter. It was also the case that the happier the men rated their relationships, the more positive women were in rating how they felt during the disagreement.

Table 4.5.1.6: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female stated happiness of their relationship compared to friends' and women's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	.083	.503	-.002	.984
Fisher female on self-male on female	-.223	.069	-.145	.212
Difference female on self-male on female	.353**	.003	.193	.095

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

4.5.1.4 Male on female & Female on male on female

The following is an analysis of the relationship between what women said that men reported about how women felt during the disagreement (**DRF 2**) versus how men thought women felt during the disagreement (**DRF 1**). Demographic variables were assessed alongside to ascertain whether certain variables impacted the extent to which women were able to predict how men said women felt during the disagreement.

There were no significant correlations and/or differences between the following demographic variables and how accurately women thought men said women felt (**DRF 2**) on the DRFQ: age (see **appendix 4.5.25**), religiousness (see **appendix 4.5.26**), children (see **appendix 4.5.27**), how long couples were together (see **appendix 4.5.28**), therapy (see **appendix 4.5.29**), parents' marital satisfaction (see **appendix 4.5.30**), ethnicity (see **appendix 4.5.31**), education (see **appendix 4.5.32**) and marital status (see **appendix 4.5.33**).

Happiness of relationship compared to friends' relationships

It appears that the higher men rated their relationships compared to friends' relationships, the more positive women were in their ratings on what they thought that men thought women were feeling during the disagreement, Rho (67) = .350, p = .004.

Table 4.5.1.7: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of the happiness of their relationship compared to friends' relationships and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men thought women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought women felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female	.350**	.004	.109	.348
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	-.112	.365	.092	.429
Difference female on male on female-male on female	.273*	.026	.128	.272

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

4.5.1.5 Female on male & Male on female on male

The following is an analysis of the relationship between what men said that women reported about how men felt during the disagreement (**DRF 2**) versus how

women thought men felt during the disagreement (**DRF 1**). Demographic variables were assessed alongside to ascertain whether certain variables impacted the extent to which men were able to predict how women said men felt during the disagreement.

There were no significant correlations and/or differences between the following demographic variables and how accurately men thought women said men felt (**DRF 2**) on the DRFQ: happiness of relationship compared to friends' (see **appendix 4.5.34**), parents' marital satisfaction (see **appendix 4.5.35**), ethnicity (see **appendix 4.5.36**), education (see appendix **4.5.37**), marital status (see **appendix 4.5.38**), age (see **appendix 4.5.39**), religiousness (see **appendix 4.5.40**), children (see **appendix 4.5.41**), how long together (see **appendix 4.5.42**) and therapy (see **appendix 4.5.43**).

4.5.1.6 Male on female on male & Female on male on female on male

The following is an analysis of the relationship between what women said that men reported about what women thought men felt during the disagreement (**DRF 3**) compared to what men thought women said that men felt during the disagreement (**DRF 2**). Demographic variables were assessed alongside to ascertain whether certain variables impacted the extent to which women were able to predict what men thought women said men felt during the disagreement.

There were no significant correlations or differences between the following demographic variables and how accurately women thought men said women thought men felt (**DRF 3**) on the DRFQ: religiousness (see **appendix 4.5.44**), how long couples were together (see **appendix 4.5.45**) ethnicity (see **appendix 4.5.46**), education (see appendix **4.5.47**), marital status (see **appendix 4.5.48**), age (see **appendix 4.5.49**), children (see **appendix 4.5.50**), happiness of relationship

compared to friends' (see **appendix 4.5.51**) and parents' marital satisfaction (see **appendix 4.5.52**).

Therapy

It appears that the correlation between women predicting what men said women thought men felt and what men said women thought men felt during the disagreement was significantly higher for women who were in therapy than for women who were not in therapy, $t(96) = -3.037$, $p = .003$.

Table 4.5.1.8: T-value for whether men and women were in therapy and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men said women said that men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what men said women thought about how men felt

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female on male	1.584	.117	.819	.418
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-2.066	.042*	-3.037**	.003
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.062	.951	-.835	.406

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

4.5.1.7 Female on male on female & Male on female on male on female

The following is an analysis of the relationship between what men said that women reported about what men thought women felt during the disagreement (**DRF 3**) versus what women thought men said that women felt during the disagreement (**DRF 2**). Demographic variables were assessed alongside to ascertain whether certain variables impacted the extent to which men were able to predict what women thought men said women felt during the disagreement.

There were no significant correlations or differences between the following demographic variables and how accurately men thought women said men thought women felt (**DRF 3**) on the DRFQ: religiousness (see **appendix 4.5.53**), happiness of relationship compared to friends' (see **appendix 4.5.54**), therapy (see **appendix 4.5.55**), parents' marital satisfaction (see **appendix 4.5.56**), ethnicity (see **appendix**

4.5.57), education (see **appendix 4.5.58**), marital status (see **appendix 4.5.59**), age (see **appendix 4.5.60**), children (see **appendix 4.5.61**) and how long together (see **appendix 4.5.62**).

4.5.1.8 How men said they were and acted & How women thought men said they were and acted

The following is an analysis of the relationship between how men said they were and acted during the disagreement and what women thought men said about how they were and acted during the disagreement (**DRF 4 & 5**). Demographic variables were assessed alongside to see whether certain variables impacted the extent to which women were able to predict how men said they were and acted during the disagreement.

The following sections are different from the previous sections in some key ways. First, in the following sections, participants were asked to rate how they thought their partners responded, versus in the previous sections where participants were asked to rate what they thought their partners felt; what they thought their partners thought that they felt, etc. A second point of difference concerning the analysis has to do with the inclusion of a correlation that takes into account the extent to which men and women rated their partners similarly to how they rated themselves during the disagreement. In other words, if there is a very high correlation between a couple in terms of how they each responded in a given section and there is a very high correlation between, for example, how the man said he acted and how the woman thought the man said he acted, this second correlation takes the couple's similarity into account. Therefore, in the following sections, it is important to assess how similar partners were in their responses in addition to their respective predictive abilities.

Finally, there are two sections, or sub-sections, that are included in the following analysis. They are similar in the sense that 'section a' asks participants to rate how they *were* during the disagreement (and later how they think their partners said they *were*), and 'section b' asks participants to rate how they *acted* during the disagreement (and later how they think their partners said they *acted*).

There were no significant correlations or differences between the following demographic variables and how women thought men said they were on the DRFQ (**DRF 4 & 5**): religiousness (see **appendix 4.5.63**), children (see **appendix 4.5.64**), age (see **appendix 4.5.65**), how long couples were together (see **appendix 4.5.66**) happiness of relationship compared to friends' (see **appendix 4.5.67**), therapy (see **appendix 4.5.68**), ethnicity (see **appendix 4.5.69**) and marital status (see **appendix 4.5.70**).

Parents' marital satisfaction

It appears, somewhat counter-intuitively, especially with respect to findings from previous sections, that the higher both men and women rated their parents' marital satisfaction, the less able women were to predict how men said they were during the disagreement, Rho (67) = -.352, p = .004 (male ratings, controlling for projection) and Rho (76) = -.231, p = .045 (female ratings, controlling for projection). This interpretation is based on there being significantly lower correlations between how men said they were and how women thought men said they were the higher men and women rated their parents' marital satisfaction.

One might hypothesize that just as with self-ratings of relationship satisfaction, that there would be scores that reflect defensive idealization and less reflective capacity and that there would be scores that would reflect higher reflective capacity.

Table 4.5.1.9: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of their parents' marital satisfaction and women's ratings concerning how they thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on self (a)	.206	.103	-.139	.231
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	-.298*	.017	-.281*	.014
Fisher controlling for projection (a)	-.352**	.004	-.231*	.045
Difference male on self female on male (a)	.028	.826	.115	.321
Fisher male on self-female on self (b)	-.007	.958	-.066	.570
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	-.079	.538	-.098	.402
Difference male on self female on male (b)	-.034	.787	.013	.913

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Education

It appears that university educated women were significantly more able to predict how men said they were during the disagreement than high school educated women, $t = -2.775$, $p = .007$ (controlling for projection). This is based on there being a significantly higher correlation between how men said they were and how women thought men said they were. There was also a significant difference between university and non-university educated women in terms of their difference scores with respect to how men said they were and how women thought men said they were, $t = 3.373$, $p = .001$. This result complements the first result (higher correlation and lower difference).

Also, there was a significant difference between university and non-university educated men in terms of women's difference scores, $t = 2.858$, $p = .005$. This means that women whose partners were university educated also had lower difference scores than women whose partners were not university educated. This could easily be confounded with the fact that university educated women were more likely to have been with university educated men.

Table 4.5.1.10: T-value for male and female level of education and women's ratings concerning how they thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on self (a)	.639	.525	.644	.521
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	-2.099*	.039	-2.862**	.005
Fisher controlling for projection (a)	-2.524*	.013	-2.775**	.007
Difference male on self-female on male (a)	2.858**	.005	3.373**	.001
Fisher male on self-female on self (b)	-.193	.848	-.510	.612
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	-1.059	.292	-1.253	.213
Difference male on self-female on male (b)	.089	.929	1.032	.305

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

4.5.1.9 How women said they were and acted & How men thought women said they were and acted

The following is an analysis of the relationship between how women said they were and acted during the disagreement and what men thought women said about how they were and acted during the disagreement (**DRF 4 & 5**). Demographic variables were assessed alongside to see whether certain variables impacted the extent to which men were able to predict how women said they were and acted during the disagreement.

There were no significant correlations or differences between the following demographic variables and how men thought women said they were and acted on the DRFQ (**DRF 4 & 5**): age (see **appendix 4.5.71**), children (see **appendix 4.5.72**), how long couples were together (see **appendix 4.5.73**), happiness of relationship compared to friends' (see **appendix 4.5.74**), therapy (see **appendix 4.5.75**), parents' marital satisfaction (see **appendix 4.5.76**), religiousness (see **appendix 4.5.77**), ethnicity (see **appendix 4.5.78**) and education (see **appendix 4.5.79**).

Marital Status

It appears that men who were either living with their partner or married versus dating, were more able to predict how women said they were during the disagreement,

f = 5.278, p = .007 (controlling for projection). This is based on there being significantly higher correlations between how women said they were and how men thought women said they were for couples who were either married, or co-habiting versus dating and not living together.

Table 4.5.1.11: F-value for couple marital status (dating, co-habiting, but not married, or married) and men's ratings concerning how they thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Couples (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on self (a)	.559	.574
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	4.140*	.019
Fisher controlling for projection (a)	5.278**	.007
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	3.089*	.050
Fisher male on self-female on self (b)	.002	.998
Fisher female on self-male on female (b)	.904	.408
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	2.277	.108

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

4.5.1.10 Summary of findings for DRF and Demographics

It is important to state, before reviewing the significant relationships between DRF scores and demographic variables, that concordance between men and women was not taken into account in the analysis. For example, are women more likely to be in therapy than men? This was not taken into account simply due to the amount of other analyses performed. The following are the significant relationships between DRF scores and demographic variables followed by summary tables 4.5.1.12 and 4.5.1.13.

It appears that the older the men and women, the more "negative" men were in rating their feelings on the DRFQ.

Women who were in therapy had higher correlations in predicting what men said women thought men felt (DRF 3).

The higher men rated their parents' marital satisfaction, the lower women's correlation scores were in predicting how they thought men said they were during the disagreement (DRF 4).

University educated women had higher correlation scores in predicting how their partners said they were during the disagreement (DRF 4) versus non-university educated men and women.

Table 4.5.1.12: Summary table of male and female demographics and male DRF scores

	Male on self vs. Female on self	**Male on female vs. Female on self**	**Male on female on male vs. Female on male**	**Male on female on male on female vs. Female on male on female**	**Male on female (How he said she was & acted...) vs. Female on self**
Age	Older men: men less positive Older women: men less positive	----------	----------	----------	----------
Religiousness	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Children	Men with children: men less positive	----------	----------	----------	----------
How long together	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Happiness of relationship compared to friends' relationships	----------	Happier men: bigger difference	----------	----------	----------
Therapy	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Parents' marital satisfaction	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Ethnicity	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Education	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Marital status	----------	----------	----------	----------	Couples who were either married or co-habiting: higher correlation

Table 4.5.1.13: Summary table of male and female demographics and female DRF scores

	Male on self vs. Female on self	Female on male vs. Male on self	Female on male on female vs. Male on female	Female on male on female on male vs. Male on female on male	Female on male (How she said he was & acted...) vs. Male on self
Age	----------	Older men: lower difference	----------	----------	----------
Religiousness	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Children	Women with children: women less positive	----------	----------	----------	----------
How long together	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Happiness of relationship compared to friends' relationships	Happier men: women more positive	Happier men: women more positive	Happier men: women more positive	----------	----------
Therapy	----------	----------	----------	Women in therapy: higher correlation	----------
Parents' marital satisfaction	----------	----------	----------	----------	Happier men rated parents' marital satisfaction: lower correlation
Ethnicity	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Education	----------	----------	----------	----------	University educated women: higher correlation and lower difference
Marital status	----------	----------	----------	----------	Couples who were either married or co-habiting: higher correlation

4.5.2 DRF & other variables

4.5.2.1 DRF and Attachment Style

The following is an analysis of the relationship between how men and women responded on the DRFQ and their respective attachment style scores as ascertained by the Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire - Revised (ECR-R) (Fraley, Brennan, & Waller, 2000).

There were no significant correlations or differences between male attachment style anxiety and avoidance scores and the following male and female DRFQ scores: how men thought women said men felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.80**), male on female on male on female (**DRF 3**) and female on male on female on male (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.81**), how women said men were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) (see **appendix 4.5.82**) and how men said women were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) (see **appendix 4.5.83**).

There were no significant correlations or differences between female attachment style anxiety and avoidance scores and male on female on male on female (**DRF 3**) and female on male on female on male (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.84**) ($p <$ .05), how men said women were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) during the disagreement (see appendix **4.5.85**) and how women said men were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) (see appendix **4.5.86**) ($p < .05$).

Male ECR-R Anxiety and Avoidant Scores with DRF Scores for men and women on self

It appears that the more anxious and avoidant men were respectively, based on their responses on the ECR-R, the less positive they were in describing how they felt during the disagreement, Rho = -.300, $p = .003$ and Rho = -.375, $p = .000$, respectively. The same goes for male avoidance scores and the way in which women

responded about how they felt during the disagreement on the DRFQ. The more avoidant the men's scores, the less positive the women said they felt during the disagreement, Rho = -.386, p = .000. The same relationship held true for male anxiety scores and how women reported they felt during the disagreement at the .05 level.

Table 4.5.2.14: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for how men and women rated their own feelings during the disagreement

Variable	Male Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	-.300**	.003	-.375**	.000
Mean female on self	-.256*	.012	-.386**	.000
Fisher male-female on self	.062	.546	-.051	.623
Difference male-female on self	-.007	.946	.062	.551

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Female ECR-R Anxiety and Avoidant Scores with DRF Scores for men and women on self

It appears that the higher women were on their anxiety and avoidant scores respectively, the less positive they were in describing how they felt during the disagreement on the DRFQ, Rho = -.494, p = .000 and Rho = -.502, p = .000, respectively. The same was true for female anxiety and avoidance scores and how men said they felt, Rho = -.302, p = .003 and Rho = -.289, p = .004, respectively.

It also appears that the higher the women's anxiety and avoidance scores, the more different men and women were in describing how they felt during the disagreement on the DRFQ at the .05 level, Rho = .236, p = .021.

Table 4.5.2.15: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for how men and women rated their own feelings during the disagreement

Variable	Female Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	-.302**	.003	-.289**	.004
Mean female on self	-.494**	.000	-.502**	.000
Fisher male-female on self	-.117	.257	.052	.612
Difference male-female on self	.216*	.035	.236*	.021

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Male ECR-R Anxiety and Avoidant Scores with DRF Scores for how men thought women felt and how women thought men felt

It appears that the more anxious men were, the less positive they were in their appraisals of women's feelings, Rho = -.276, p = .007.

Table 4.5.2.16: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for how men thought women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	-.276**	.007	-.162	.116
Fisher female on self-male on female	-.086	.486	-.030	.771
Difference female on self- male on female	.000	.999	-.195	.057

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

It appears that the higher the male anxiety and avoidance scores, the less positive women were in assessing how men felt during the disagreement, Rho = -.298, p = .003, and Rho = -.447, p = .000, respectively.

Table 4.5.2.17: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for how women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	-.298**	.003	-.447**	.000
Fisher male on self-female on male	-.065	.528	.025	.805
Difference male on self- female on male	.038	.716	.137	.183

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Female ECR-R Anxiety and Avoidant Scores with DRF Scores for how men thought women felt and how women thought men felt

It appears that the higher women's anxiety and avoidance scores respectively, the lower the difference between how women said they felt during the disagreement on the DRFQ and how men thought women felt, Rho = -.313, p = .002 and Rho = -.319, p = .002, respectively.

One interpretation for this could be that more insecure women were easier to predict and more transparent than secure women. Another reason could be that insecure women were more likely to be with insecure men whose higher DRF scores

reflected a defensive need to know what their partners felt in order to protect themselves.

Table 4.5.2.18: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for how men thought women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	-.196	.056	-.167	.103
Fisher female on self-male on female	.202*	.049	.152	.140
Difference female on self- male on female	-.313**	.002	-.319**	.002

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Women who rated higher in anxiety and avoidance respectively, were less positive in their appraisals of how men felt during the disagreement on the DRFQ, Rho = -.423, p = .000 and Rho = -.389, p = .000. It also appears that the more anxious women were, the bigger the difference in predicting how men felt on the DRFQ at the .05 level.

Table 4.5.2.19: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for how women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	-.423**	.000	-.389**	.000
Fisher male on self-female on male	-.071	.490	.057	.579
Difference male on self- female on male	.216*	.035	.182	.075

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Male ECR-R Anxiety and Avoidant Scores with DRF Scores for what men thought women said men felt and what women thought men said women felt

There were no significant correlations or differences at the .01 level between male anxiety and avoidant scores and DRF scores for what women thought men said women felt during the disagreement versus what men said women felt. It does appear however that the more anxious the men were, the lower the correlation between what women thought men said women felt and what men said they thought women felt at the .05 level, Rho = -.239, p = .019.

Table 4.5.2.20: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for how women thought men said women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female- female on male on female	-.239*	.019	.005	.964
Difference male on female- female on male on female	-.052	.612	-.124	.230

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Female ECR-R Anxiety and Avoidant Scores with DRF Scores for what men thought women said men felt and what women thought men said women felt

It appears that the higher the women's anxiety and avoidance scores, the bigger the difference between what men thought that women said that men felt during the disagreement versus what women said men felt at the .05 level, Rho = .254, p = .013 and Rho = .250, p = .014, respectively.

Table 4.5.2.21: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for how men thought women said men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male-male on female on male	-.177	.084	-.074	.472
Difference female on male-male on female on male	.254*	.013	.250*	.014

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

It appears that the higher the women's anxiety and avoidant scores, the lower the difference between what women thought men said women felt versus what men said they thought women felt, Rho = -.283, p = .005 and Rho = -.326, p = .001, respectively.

It is interesting that higher female anxiety could be seen as having inhibited men's abilities to predict what women thought men felt during the disagreement (based on higher difference scores), whereas higher anxiety and avoidance scores were correlated with more accurate assessments by women concerning what they thought men said that women felt during the disagreement on the DRFQ (based on lower difference scores).

This could reflect the need for more anxious women to know what their partners think about them as opposed to knowing how their partners feel themselves. It might also mean that more anxious women play quite a large role in shaping their partners perspectives of them and that much of what the men said about how women felt was based on enacted projections from the women.

Table 4.5.2.22: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for how women thought men said women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female-female on male on female	.015	.883	-.069	.504
Difference male on female-female on male on female	-.283**	.005	-.326**	.001

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Summary of findings for DRF and Attachment Style

Overall, men and women were less positive in rating their own feelings and their partners' feelings the more anxious and avoidant they were. It is interesting that the more anxious and avoidant men and women were, the more different they were in how they rated their respective feelings about themselves.

It seems that the more anxious and avoidant women were, the more accurate men were in rating how women felt (**DRF 1**) based on lower difference scores. The opposite was true for the women concerning their ratings of men's scores. The more anxious and avoidant the women were, the bigger the difference scores in predicting how men felt (**DRF 1**) at the .05 level.

While more anxiety and avoidance was related to more accuracy for men in predicting women's feelings, at the second order level of metacognition, male on female on male and female on male on female (**DRF 2**), the opposite was true for both men and women at the .05 level. The more anxious the men were, the lower the women's DRF 2 scores, and the more anxious and avoidant the women were, the bigger the difference scores for men predicting what women said men felt.

Finally, the more anxious and avoidant women were, the lower their difference scores in predicting what men thought women felt. All significant results are summarized in tables 4.5.2.23 and 4.5.2.24.

Table 4.5.2.23: Summary table of male and female ECR-R attachment style scores and male DRF scores

	Male on self	Male on female vs. Female on self	Male on female on male vs. Female on male	Male on female on male on female vs. Female on male on female	Male on female (How he said she was & acted...) vs. Female on self
Male anxiety	More anxious men: Men less positive	More anxious men: Men less positive about women's feelings	----------	----------	----------
Male avoidance	More avoidant men: Men less positive	----------	----------	----------	----------
Female anxiety	More anxious women: Men less positive	More anxious women: Lower difference male on female vs. female on self	----------	----------	----------
Female avoidance	More avoidant women: Men less positive	More avoidant women: Lower difference male on female vs. female on self	----------	----------	----------

Table 4.5.2.24: Summary table of male and female ECR-R attachment style scores and female DRF scores

	Female on self	Female on male vs. Male on self	Female on male on female vs. Male on female	Female on male on female on male vs. Male on female on male	Female on male (How she said he was & acted...) vs. Male on self
Male anxiety	---------- -	More anxious men: Women less positive about men's feelings	----------	----------	----------
Male avoidance	More avoidant men: Women less positive	More avoidant men: Women less positive about men's feelings	----------	----------	----------
Female anxiety	More anxious women: Women less positive	More anxious women: Women less positive about men's feelings	More anxious women: Lower difference female on male on female vs. male on female	----------	----------
Female avoidance	More avoidant women: Women less positive	More avoidant women: Women less positive about men's feelings	More avoidant women: Lower difference female on male on female vs. male on female	----------	----------

4.5.2.2 Dyadic Reflective Functioning and Psychological Mindedness

The following is an analysis of the relationship between how men and women responded on the DRFQ and their respective psychological mindedness scores as ascertained by the Psychological Mindedness Scale (Conte, Plutchik, Jung, & Picard, 1990). As in the previous section, only significant correlations and differences below the .01 level will be discussed due to the quantity of operations performed.

There were no significant correlations or differences between male and female psychological mindedness scores and the following male and female DRFQ scores: how men thought women felt (**DRF 1**) and how women thought men felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.87**), how men thought women said men felt (**DRF 2**) and how women thought men said women felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.88**), male on female

on male on female (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.89**), female on male on female on male (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.90**) ($p < .05$).

Male and Female Psychological Mindedness Scores with DRF Scores for what men thought women said about how women were and acted during the disagreement and what women thought men said about how men were and acted

There were no significant correlations below the .01 level between male psychological mindedness scores and men's abilities to predict how women said they were and acted during the disagreement they jointly chose on the DRFQ

It appears that women with higher psychological mindedness scores were better able to predict how men said they were during the disagreement on the DRFQ, Rho = .314, $p = .002$ (based on a higher correlation between how men said they were vs. how women thought men said they were). It is interesting that when projection is controlled for, in other words, the similarity between how women said they felt and how women thought their partners' felt, the power of the correlation is reduced substantially, Rho = .259, $p = .011$.

Table 4.5.2.25: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female psychological mindedness scores and DRF scores for how men thought women said women were and acted during the disagreement and how women thought men said men were and acted

Variable	Male Psychological Mindedness (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Psychological Mindedness (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women were...)	.152	.139	.050	.625
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women acted...)	.037	.724	.046	.658
Difference female on self – male on female (how women were...)	.135	.188	.006	.956
Difference female on self – male on female (how women acted...)	.250*	.014	-.006	.954
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men were...)	.053	.608	.314**	.002
Fisher male on self – female on male (controlling for projection)	-.014	.891	.259*	.011
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men acted...)	-.118	.254	.071	.492
Difference male on self – female on male (how men were...)	.071	.494	-.023	.822
Difference male on self – female on male (how men acted...)	.006	.950	.106	.304

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Summary of findings for DRF and Psychological Mindedness

Since there was only one significant finding between male and female psychological mindedness and DRF scores, the results will be summarised verbally instead of using a summary table. Women with higher psychological mindedness scores had significantly higher correlations between how men said they were and how women thought men said they were during the disagreement.

4.5.2.3 DRF and Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised Short Form (EPQ-R S)

The following is an analysis of the relationship between how men and women responded on the DRFQ and their respective scores on the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised Short Form (EPQ-R S) (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991). As in the previous section, only significant correlations and differences below the .01 level will be discussed due to the quantity of operations performed.

There were no significant correlations or differences between male EPQ-R S scores and the following male and female DRFQ scores: how men thought women felt (**DRF 1**) and how women thought men felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.91**), how men thought women said men felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.92**) ($p < .05$), how women thought men said women felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.93**), male on female on male on female (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.94**), how men said women were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) (see **appendix 4.5.95**) and how women said men were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) (see **appendix 4.5.96**) ($p < .05$).

There were no significant correlations or differences between female EPQ-R S scores and the following male and female DRFQ scores: how men thought women felt (**DRF 1**) and how women thought men felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.97**), how men thought women said men felt (**DRF 2**) and how women thought men said women felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.98**), male on female on male on female (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.99**), female on male on female on male (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.100**) ($p < .05$) and how women said men were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) (see **appendix 4.5.101**).

Male and female EPQ-R S scores with DRF Scores for what men said women thought men said women felt and what women said men thought women said men felt

It appears that the higher men's scores on the Lying scale of the EPQ-R S, the lower the difference between what men said women thought men felt during the disagreement and what women thought men said women thought men felt, Rho = -.293, $p = .004$.

It is possible that women whose partners scored higher on the lying scale developed greater reflective skills in order to better understand what was going on in their partners' minds.

Table 4.5.2.26: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for what women said men thought women said men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male EPI P (N =96)	Sig.(2-Tailed)	Male EPI E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Male EPI N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Male EPI L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male - female on male on female on male	.130	.207	.004	.967	-.058	.575	-.063	.539
Difference male on female on male - female on male on female on male	-.124	.227	-.089	.390	.153	.137	-.293**	.004

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Male and Female EPI Scores with Reflective Functioning Scores for what men thought women said about how women were and acted during the disagreement and what women thought men said about how men were and acted

It appears that the higher women's scores were on the Lying scale of the EPQ-R S, the better able men were at predicting how women said they were during the disagreement on the DRFQ, Rho = .270, p = .008 (based on a higher correlation between how men thought women said they were and how women said they were). When projection is taken into account, in other words, the similarity between women's scores and men's scores, the strength of the correlation is decreased substantially, Rho = .250, p = .014.

Table 4.5.2.27: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for how men thought women said women were and acted during the disagreement

Variable	Female EPI P (N =96)	Sig.(2-Tailed)	Female EPI E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Female EPI N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Female EPI L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women were...)	.005	.962	.052	.616	.037	.717	.270**	.008
Fisher female on self – male on female (controlling for projection)	-.057	.581	.028	.788	.033	.747	.250*	.014
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women acted...)	.040	.701	-.049	.639	.067	.518	-.032	.757
Difference female on self – male on female (how women were...)	-.059	.567	-.047	.649	.160	.119	-.231*	.023
Difference female on self – male on female (how women acted...)	-.160	.120	.067	.514	.055	.593	.007	.945

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Summary of findings for DRF and EPQ-R S

Since there were few significant findings between male and female scores on the EPQ-R S and DRF scores, the results will be summarised verbally instead of using a summary table. 1) If men had higher scores on the Lying scale, women had lower difference scores on what they thought men said women thought men felt versus what men said women thought men felt. 2) If women had higher scores on the Lying scale, men had a higher correlation between how women said they were and how men thought women said they were, but the significance was reduced to the .05 level when controlling for projection.

4.5.2.4 DRF and the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems

The following is an analysis of the relationship between how men and women responded on the DRFQ concerning how they felt during the disagreement and their respective scores on the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems – Circumplex (IIP-C) (Alden et al., 1990). As in the previous section, only significant correlations and

differences below the .01 level will be discussed due to the quantity of operations performed.

There were no significant correlations or differences between male interpersonal problem scores and the following male and female DRFQ scores: how men thought women felt (**DRF 1**) and how women thought men felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.102**), how women thought men said women felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.103**), male on female on male on female (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.104**), female on male on female on male (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.105**) ($p <$ .05) and how men said women were and acted and how women said men were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) (see **appendix 4.5.106**).

There were no significant correlations or differences between female interpersonal problem scores and the following male and female DRFQ scores: how men thought women felt (**DRF 1**) and how women thought men felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.102**), how women thought men said women felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.107**) ($p < .05$), male on female on male on female (**DRF 3**) and female on male on female on male (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.108**) and how men said women were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) (see **appendix 4.5.109**).

Male and female IIP scores with DRF Scores for what men said women thought men felt and what women said men thought women felt

It appears that the higher men scored on interpersonal problems on the IIP, the less able they were to predict what women thought men felt on the DRFQ, Rho = -.259, $p = .011$ (based on a lower correlation between how men thought women said men felt vs. how women said men felt).

Table 4.5.2.28: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male IIP scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male interpersonal problems	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	-.259*	.011
Difference male on female on male-female on male	.019	.851

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

It appears that the higher women's interpersonal problem scores were on the IIP, the less able men were to predict what women thought men felt during the disagreement at the .05 level, Rho = -.224, p = .028 (based on a lower correlation).

Table 4.5.2.29: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female IIP scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female interpersonal problems	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	-.224*	.028
Difference male on female on male-female on male	.151	.142

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Male and Female IIP Scores with DRF scores for what men thought women said about how women were and acted during the disagreement and what women thought men said about how men were and acted

It appears that the higher women were on the interpersonal problems score of the IIP, the less able they were to predict how men said they were during the disagreement, Rho = -.290, p = .004 (based on a lower correlation).

Table 4.5.2.30: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female IIP scores and DRF scores for how women thought men said men were and acted during the disagreement

Variable	Female interpersonal problems (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men were...)	-.290**	.004
Fisher male on self – female on male (controlling for projection)	-.140	.175
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men acted...)	-.037	.720
Difference male on self – female on male (how men were...)	.112	.275
Difference male on self – female on male (how men acted...)	.047	.651

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Summary of findings for DRF and IIP

Since there was only one significant finding between male and female interpersonal problems and DRF scores, the results will be summarised verbally instead of using a summary table. Women with higher interpersonal problems scores had significantly lower correlations between how men said they were and how women thought men said they were during the disagreement.

4.5.2.5 DRF & ADAS

There were no significant correlations or differences between male and female abbreviated dyadic adjustment scores (Sharpley & Rogers, 1984) and the following male and female DRFQ scores: how men thought women felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.110**) ($p < .05$), how women thought men felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.111**), how men thought women said men felt (**DRF 2**) and how women thought men said

women felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.112**), male on female on male on female (**DRF 3**) and female on male on female on male (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.113**) and how men said women were and acted and how women said men were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) (see **appendix 4.5.114**).

4.5.2.6 DRF & BSI

The following is an analysis of the relationship between how men and women responded on the DRFQ concerning how they felt during the disagreement and their respective Global Severity Index (GSI) scores on the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) (Derogatis, 1975). As in the previous section, only significant correlations and differences below the .01 level will be discussed due to the quantity of operations performed.

There were no significant correlations or differences between male global severity index scores and the following male and female DRFQ scores: how men thought women felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.115**) ($p < .05$), how women thought men felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.116**), how men thought women said men felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.117**), how women thought men said women felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.118**) ($p < .05$), male on female on male on female (**DRF 3**) and female on male on female on male (**DRF 3**) (see **appendix 4.5.119**) and how men thought women said they were and acted (**DRF 4 & 5**) (see **appendix 4.5.120**) ($p < .05$).

There were no significant correlations or differences between female global severity index scores and the following male and female DRFQ scores: how men thought women felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.121**) ($p < .05$), how women thought men felt (**DRF 1**) (see **appendix 4.5.122**) ($p < .05$), how men thought women said men felt (**DRF 2**) (see **appendix 4.5.123**) ($p < .05$), how women thought men said

women felt **(DRF 2)** (see **appendix 4.5.124**), male on female on male on female **(DRF 3)** (see **appendix 4.5.125**) and how men thought women said they were and acted **(DRF 4 & 5)** (see **appendix 4.5.126**) ($p < .05$).

Male and female GSI scores with DRF Scores for what men said women thought men said women felt and what women said men thought women said men felt

It appears that the higher the women's GSI scores on the BSI, the lower the difference between what they thought men said women thought men felt during the disagreement and what men thought women said men felt Rho = -.284, $p = .005$.

Table 4.5.2.31: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female GSI scores and DRF scores for what women thought men said women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male on female on male- male on female on male	.052	.614
Difference female on male on female on male- male on female on male	-.284**	.005

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Male and Female GSI Scores with DRF scores for what men thought women said about how women were and acted during the disagreement and what women thought men said about how men were and acted

It appears that the higher men's GSI scores were on the BSI, the bigger the difference scores were for women predicting how men said they were during the disagreement on the DRFQ, Rho = .278, $p = .006$.

Table 4.5.2.32: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male GSI scores and DRF scores for how women thought men said men were and acted during the disagreement

Variable	Male GSI (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men were...)	-.121	.241
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men acted...)	-.005	.958
Difference male on self – female on male (how men were...)	.278**	.006
Difference male on self – female on male (how men acted...)	.160	.119

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

It appears that the higher women's GSI scores were on the BSI, the bigger the difference scores were for women predicting how men said they were during the disagreement on the DRFQ and the lower the correlations at the .05 level.

Table 4.5.2.33: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female GSI scores and DRF scores for how women thought men said men were and acted during the disagreement

Variable	Female GSI (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men were...)	-.243*	.017
Fisher male on self – female on male (controlling for projection)	-.224*	.028
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men acted...)	.013	.904
Difference male on self – female on male (how men were...)	.240*	.019
Difference male on self – female on male (how men acted...)	.056	.591

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Summary of findings for DRF and BSI

Since there were only two significant findings between male and female global severity index scores and DRF scores, the results will be summarised verbally instead of using a summary table. 1) Women with higher global severity index scores had significantly lower difference scores between how they said men thought women said men felt and how men thought women said men felt during the disagreement. 2) Women whose partners had higher global severity index scores had significantly higher difference scores between how they thought men said they were and how men said they were during the disagreement.

4.5.3 Inter-component correlations

The following is a brief review of the relationship between the four components derived from the principal components analysis on the four combined adjective sections of the DRFQ: Factor 1 (Avoidant), Factor 2 (Optimistic), Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) and Factor 4 (Anxious).

There was a significant negative correlation between component 1 (Avoidant) and component 2 (Optimistic), r = -.317, p = .000. There was a significant correlation between component 1 (Avoidant) and component 3 (Annoyed and Frustrated), r = .228, p = .000. There was a significant correlation between component 1 (Avoidant) and component 4 (Anxious), r = .355, p = .000. There was a significant negative correlation between component 2 (Optimistic) and component 3 (Annoyed and Frustrated), r = -.182, p = .000. There was a significant negative correlation between component 2 (Optimistic) and component 4 (Anxious), r = -.078, p = .031. There was a significant relationship between component 3 (Annoyed and Frustrated) and component 4 (Anxious), r = .243, p = .000.

Though the four components appear to be qualitatively and theoretically distinct from one another, it appears that there are strong positive and negative correlations between the respective components.

Table 4.5.3.34: Pearson's correlation coefficients between components of the DRFQ

	Component 2 (Optimistic)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Component 3 (Annoyed and Frustrated)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Component 4 (Anxious)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Component 1 (Avoidant)	-.317**	.000	.228**	.000	.355**	.000
Component 2 (Optimistic)	--	--	-.182**	.000	-.078*	.031
Component 3 (Annoyed and Frustrated)	--	--	--	--	.243**	.000

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

4.5.4 Differences between standardized factor scores

In order to assess performance on the DRFQ, individual responses within their respective relationships were compared using correlations, t-tests, t-values and difference scores. The correlation scores were the most reliable way to assess DRFQ scores based on test-retest reliability (see chapter 3).

As discussed in the methodology, a principal component analysis was conducted on the adjective sections, revealing four factors: Factor 1 (Avoidant), Factor 2 (Optimistic), Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) and Factor 4 (Anxious). In order to derive at DRF scores using these factors, differences were taken between standardized factor scores between male and female participants. So for the four adjective sections, which reflect DRF scores 1 – 3, there are four standardized difference scores reflecting the four factors for a total of 12 DRF factor scores.

In order to assess the relationship between these differences between standardized factor scores, regression analyses were performed using these difference scores as the independent or predictor variables and variables such as dyadic satisfaction, attachment style and interpersonal problems as the dependent or criterion variables. It was especially important to use a multivariate analysis for the factor scores in order to partial out variability due to the significant positive and negative correlations that exist between factors.

The twelve male scores and the twelve female scores were analyzed separately for both male and female criterion variables. Tables of analyses with insignificant models will be reported in appendices 4.5.127 – 4.5.146 for men and 4.5.147 – 4.5.167 for women. Only models and predictor variables that were significant will be discussed even though there are some significant predictor variables in the insignificant models. Also, in addition to the regression analyses, correlation matrices

for factor difference scores and other variables are located in appendices 4.5.168 – 4.5.173. The correlations will not be discussed here, though for the predictor variables, their respective correlations with the respective criterion variables will also be presented in the respective tables. The fact that individual correlations will not be discussed, again reflects the motivation to use multivariate statistics in the first place, taking into account all of the variables together versus looking at each one in isolation from the other.

4.5.4.1 Insignificant Models

Male factor difference scores and other variables

Insignificant models emerged using male difference scores as predictor variables and the following as criterion variables: male dyadic satisfaction at time 1 (see **appendix 4.5.127**), female dyadic satisfaction at time 1 (see **appendix 4.5.128**), male dyadic satisfaction at time 2 (see **appendix 4.5.129**), female dyadic satisfaction at time 2 (see **appendix 4.5.130**), couple dyadic satisfaction at time 1 (see **appendix 4.5.131**), couple dyadic satisfaction at time 2 (see **appendix 4.5.132**), male attachment style anxiety (see **appendix 4.5.133**), male attachment style avoidance (see **appendix 4.5.134**), female attachment style avoidance (see **appendix 4.5.135**), male GSI scores (see **appendix 4.5.136**), male IIP scores (see **appendix 4.5.137**), female IIP scores (see **appendix 4.5.138**), male EPQ P, E and L scores (see **appendices 4.5.139 – 4.5.141**), female EPQ E, N and L scores (see **appendices 4.5.142 – 4.5.144**), male psychological mindedness (see **appendix 4.5.145**) and female psychological mindedness (see **appendix 4.5.146**).

Female factor difference scores and other variables

Insignificant models emerged using female difference scores as predictor variables and the following as criterion variables: male dyadic satisfaction at time 1

(see **appendix 4.5.147**), female dyadic satisfaction at time 1 (see **appendix 4.5.148**), male dyadic satisfaction at time 2 (see **appendix 4.5.149**), female dyadic satisfaction at time 2 (see **appendix 4.5.150**), couple dyadic satisfaction at time 1 (see **appendix 4.5.151**), male attachment style anxiety (see **appendix 4.5.152**), male attachment style avoidance (see **appendix 4.5.153**), male GSI scores (see **appendix 4.5.154**), female GSI scores (See **appendix 4.5.155**), male IIP scores (see **appendix 4.5.156**), female IIP scores (see **appendix 4.5.157**), male EPQ P, E, N and L scores (see **appendices 4.5.158 – 4.5.161**), female EPQ P, E, N and L scores (see **appendices 4.5.162 – 4.5.165**), male psychological mindedness (see **appendix 4.5.166**) and female psychological mindedness (see **appendix 4.5.167**).

4.5.4.2 Significant models

Female factor difference scores and dyadic satisfaction

Using the enter method, an insignificant model emerged predicting couple dyadic satisfaction at time 2 from female DRF 1 factor difference scores ($F_{4,32}$ = 1.299, p = .291. Adjusted R square = .032). When female DRF 2 factor difference scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, an insignificant model emerged ($F_{8,28}$ = 1.708, p = .140. Adjusted R square = .136, significance F-change = .128). Finally, when female DRF 3 factor difference scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{12,24}$ = 3.038, p = .010. Adjusted R square = .405, significance F-change = .011). Significant predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients, correlations with the criterion variable and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 4.5.4.35: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for the significant female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and couple ADAS scores at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Factor correlations with couple ADAS at time 2	*P*
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF 2	.442	.022	.217	.196
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF 3	.471	.021	.196	.244
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF 3	-.631	.010	-.190	.259

It appears that the lower women predicted men said women were on the anxious factor on the DRFQ compared to what men said women felt, the higher the couple ADAS scores were at time 2. It also appears that the lower women said men thought women said men were on the avoidant factor compared to what men said women thought men felt, couple dyadic satisfaction was higher at time 2. Finally, it appears that the higher women said men thought women said men were on the anxious factor compared to what men said women thought men felt, couple dyadic satisfaction was higher at time 2.

This is quite interesting because it seems that women who interpreted their partners as more anxious, or more accurately, women who thought their partners said that women viewed men as more anxious, had a positive connotation with respect to increased couple dyadic satisfaction. It could be that women's interpretations of men's anxiety are qualitatively different from women's interpretations of their own anxiety through the eyes of men. For example, more male anxiety, according to women, might mean that the man is more involved in the relationship.

It is important to emphasize that it was the female DRF 3 scores that were the significant predictors of couple dyadic satisfaction at time two and not DRF 1 and 2 scores. This provides valuable support for the use of the more advanced degrees of metacognition that are employed in the DRFQ and it provides further evidence for the meaningful distinction between the respective levels.

Male factor difference scores and ECR anxiety

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting female attachment style anxiety from male DRF 1 factor difference scores ($F_{4,91} = 4.458$, $p = .002$. Adjusted R square = .127). When male DRF 2 factor difference scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{8,87} = 3.203$, $p = .003$. Adjusted R square = .157, significance F-change = .137). Finally, when male DRF 3 factor difference scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{12,83} = 2.487$, $p = .003$. Adjusted R square = .189, significance F-change = .122). Significant predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients, correlations with the criterion variable and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 4.5.4.36: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for the significant male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female ECR anxiety as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Factor correlations with female ECR anxiety	*P*
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.280	.036	.349	.000
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.246	.025	.295	.004
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.276	.027	.070	.497

It appears that the less anxious men thought women were on the DRFQ, the higher the women's anxiety on the revised Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR-R). This could be because for women who were feeling quite anxious, men's inabilities to acknowledge or understand their anxiety made them even more anxious. Also, the lower men thought women said men felt on the avoidant factor of the DRFQ compared to what women said men felt, the more anxious women were on the ECR-R. This is the converse of the previous situation.

Here, women appear to be more anxious, the less their partners acknowledge their own avoidant feelings, or the less they think women think men are avoidant. Finally, the higher men said women thought men said women felt compared to what

women said men thought women felt on the avoidant factor of the DRFQ, the more anxious women were on the ECR-R. This is similar to the avoidant factor for DRF 2, except here the roles are reversed. Broken down into more simple terms, the more avoidant men thought women said men thought women were on the DRF, the more anxious women were on the ECR.

It was the male DRF 1 scores that were the significant predictors of female attachment style anxiety and not the DRF 2 and 3 scores, as evidence by the insignificant F-changes from DRF 1 to DRF 2 and from DRF 2 to DRF 3.

Female factor difference scores and ECR anxiety

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting female attachment style anxiety from female DRF 1 factor difference scores ($F_{4,91} = 2.878$, $p = .027$. Adjusted R square = .073). When female DRF 2 factor difference scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{8,87} = 4.268$, $p = .000$. Adjusted R square = .216, significance F-change = .001). Finally, when female DRF 3 factor difference scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{12,83} = 3.062$, $p = .001$. Adjusted R square = .207, significance F-change = .562). Significant predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients, correlations with the criterion variable and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 4.5.4.37: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for the significant female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female ECR anxiety as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Factor correlations with female ECR anxiety	*P*
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.249	.031	-.236	.021
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.255	.028	.055	.596
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.327	.006	.318	.002
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.313	.006	-.346	.001

It appears that the more avoidant women thought men were compared to how men said they were themselves on the DRFQ, the more anxious women were on the ECR-R. It is interesting that the less anxious women thought men were compared to how men said they were, the more anxious women were on the ECR-R. This might reflect a conscious denial of men's anxiety, which manifests itself in their own (female) anxiety. It appears that the less optimistic women said men thought women were on the DRFQ compared to what men thought women felt, the more anxious women were on the ECR-R. It also appears that the more anxious women thought men said women were compared to what men said women were, the more anxious women were on the ECR-R.

It was the female DRF 1 and 2 scores that were the significant predictors of female attachment style anxiety and not the DRF 3 scores, as evidence by the insignificant F-changes from DRF 2 to DRF 3.

Female factor difference scores and ECR avoidance

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting female attachment style avoidance from female DRF 1 factor difference scores ($F_{4,91} = 3.254$, $p = .015$. Adjusted R square = .087). When female DRF 2 factor difference scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{8,87} = 3.074$, $p = .004$. Adjusted R square = .149, significance F-change = .038). Finally, when female DRF 3 factor difference scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{12,83} = 2.544$, $p = .007$. Adjusted R square = .163, significance F-change = .249). Significant predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients, correlations with the criterion variable and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 4.5.4.38: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for the significant female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female ECR avoidance as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Factor correlations with female ECR avoidance	*P*
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.225	.048	.203	.048
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.264	.028	.284	.005

It appears that the less annoyed and frustrated women thought men were compared to how men said they were, the more avoidant women were on the ECR-R. This could reflect more unwillingness of avoidant women to recognize their partners' feelings. The less optimistic women thought men said women were compared to how men said women were, the more avoidant women were on the ECR-R.

Again, it was the female DRF 1 and 2 scores that were the significant predictors of female attachment style anxiety and not the DRF 3 scores, as evidence by the insignificant F-changes from DRF 2 to DRF 3.

Male factor difference scores and Global Severity Index scores (GSI) on the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

Using the enter method, an insignificant model emerged predicting male GSI scores from male DRF 1 factor difference scores ($F_{4,91} = 2.241, p = .071$. Adjusted R square = .050). When male DRF 2 factor difference scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, an insignificant model emerged ($F_{8,87} = 1.987, p = .057$. Adjusted R square = .077, significance F-change = .165). Finally, when male DRF 3 factor difference scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{12,83} = 2.182, p = .020$. Adjusted R square = .130, significance F-change = .063). Significant predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients, correlations with the criterion variable and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 4.5.4.39: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for the significant male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female GSI scores as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Factor correlations with female GSI scores	*P*
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.324	.002	.260	.010
Factor 3 (Optimistic) DRF2	.286	.012	.221	.030
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.279	.031	.159	.122

It appears that the less annoyed and frustrated men said women were compared to how women said they were, the higher were women's Global Severity Index scores (GSI) on the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI). A possible explanation for this is that the more unwilling men were to acknowledge their partners' upset during a major issue of disagreement, the more the women manifested psychological symptoms themselves. It also appears that the less optimistic men thought women said men were compared to what women said men were, the higher the women's GSI scores. This is a powerful example of the complexity of the couple's psychology, the fact that men who think their partners could view them as less optimistic would impact women's manifestations of psychological symptoms. Finally, the less avoidant men thought women said men thought women were compared to how women thought men said women were, the higher the women's GSI scores.

As in the first example, it was the male DRF 3 scores that were the significant predictors of male GSI scores and not the DRF 1 and 2 scores, though the f-change from DRF 2 to DRF 3 barely missed significance even though the model was significant.

Male factor difference scores and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ)

Using the enter method, an insignificant model emerged predicting male EPQ neuroticism scores from male DRF 1 factor difference scores ($F_{4,91} = 1.238, p = .300$. Adjusted R square = .010). When male DRF 2 factor difference scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, an insignificant model emerged ($F_{8,87} = 1.491, p = .172$.

Adjusted R square = .040, significance F-change = .156). Finally, when male DRF 3 factor difference scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{12,83} = 2.902$, $p = .002$. Adjusted R square = .194, significance F-change = .001). Significant predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients, correlations with the criterion variable and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 4.5.4.40: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for the significant male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male EPQ Neuroticism as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Factor correlations with male EPQ neuroticism	*P*
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.379	.005	-.201	.049
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.324	.010	.068	.511
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.388	.001	-.344	.001

It appears that the more avoidant men thought women were on the DRFQ compared to how women said they were, the more neurotic men were on the revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire short form (EPQ-R S). It also appears that the more anxious men said women thought men said women were compared to what women said men thought women were, the more neurotic men were on the EPQ.

Again, it was the male DRF 3 scores that were the significant predictors of male GSI scores and not the DRF 1 and 2 scores, as evidence by the significant f-change from DRF 2 to DRF 3.

Using the enter method, an insignificant model emerged predicting female EPQ psychoticism scores from male DRF 1 factor difference scores ($F_{4,91} = 1.668$, $p = .164$. Adjusted R square = .027). When male DRF 2 factor difference scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, an insignificant model emerged ($F_{8,87} = 1.935$, $p = .065$. Adjusted R square = .073, significance F-change = .085). Finally, when male DRF 3 factor difference scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{12,83} = 1.872$, $p = .050$. Adjusted R square = .099, significance F-

change = .174). Significant predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients, correlations with the criterion variable and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 4.5.4.41: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for the significant male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female EPQ Psychoticism as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Factor correlations with female EPQ psychoticism	*P*
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.437	.002	.238	.019

It appears that the less anxious men thought women were compared to how women said they were on the DRFQ, the higher were women's psychoticism scores on the EPQ. This could be yet another example of a refusal or inability to acknowledge the other's feelings literally driving the other person crazy.

Once again, it was the male DRF 3 scores that were the significant predictors of male GSI scores and not the DRF 1 and 2 scores, though the f-change from DRF 2 to DRF 3 was not significant.

4.5.5 Gender differences in factor difference scores

In order to assess if there were differences in the way men and women responded on the four factors of the respective DRF adjective scales, Wilcoxon paired-sample tests were conducted for each factor for DRF 1 – 3 comparing male and female factor difference scores. There were no significant differences between men and women for any of the factors on DRF 1, 2 or 3 (see **appendix 4.5.174**).

4.5.6 Projection and the DRFQ

The primary scores of the DRFQ measure the capacity to think and reflect on one's partner's thoughts and feelings to varying degrees of difficulty. The theoretical basis for this methodology has been discussed, as has the reliability of DRF scoring and the relationship between these scores and other variables such as dyadic satisfaction and attachment style. Another critical component in assessing one's capacity to reflect on another has to do with how similarly, or differently, members of

couples are to one another, how much members of couples project or attribute their own thoughts or feelings onto their partners and finally and how much all of this relates to critical variables such as dyadic satisfaction, attachment style, interpersonal problems, etc.

In order to assess the extent to which individuals attributed or projected their own thoughts and feelings onto their partners, intra-individual correlations were carried out resulting in three distinct projection scores for each individual: 1) Correlation between what partner 1 said about how he/she felt on the adjective scales vs. what he/she thought his/her partner felt on the adjective scales. 2) Correlation between what partner 1 said about how he/she felt on the adjective scales vs. what partner 1 thought partner 2 said partner 1 felt on the adjective scales. 3) Correlation between how partner 1 said he/she was and acted during the disagreement vs. how partner 1 thought partner 2 responded about how he/she was and acted during the disagreement.

4.5.6.1 Insignificant relationships

As aforementioned, there are three projection correlation scores for each individual. The following variables did not correlate significantly with any of the three projection scores for the male participants (see **appendix 4.5.175** for correlations and p-values for all of the following variables with male projection scores): male ECR anxiety, male ECR avoidance, female ECR avoidance, male psychological mindedness, female psychological mindedness, male EPQ psychoticism, male EPQ extraversion, male EPQ neuroticism, male EPQ lying, female EPQ psychoticism, female EPQ extraversion, female EPQ lying, female IIP, female GSI, male ADAS at time 1, male ADAS at time 2 and female ADAS at time 2.

The following variables did not correlate significantly with any of the three projection scores for the female participants (see **appendix 4.5.176** for correlations and p-values for all of the following variables with female projection scores): female psychological mindedness, male EPQ psychoticism, male EPQ extraversion, male EPQ neuroticism, male EPQ lying, female EPQ extraversion, female EPQ lying, male IIP, male GSI, female GSI and couple ADAS at time 2.

4.5.6.2 Male projection scores and other variables

The following is a review of the significant relationships between male projection scores and other variables such as dyadic satisfaction, attachment style, etc. For purposes of simplification, the three projection scores will be summarized as follows: male on self on the adjective scales vs. male on female on the adjective scales as DRF projection score 1, male on self on the adjective scales vs. male on female on male on the adjective scales as DRF projection score 2 and male on self on how they were and acted vs. how men thought women said they were and acted as DRF projection score 3.

ECR Anxiety and Avoidance

There was a significant negative correlation between male DRF projection score 3 and female ECR anxiety, r = -.201, p = .05. The more similarly the men rated how they were and acted during the disagreement and how they thought their partners said they were and acted, the lower the women's anxiety on the Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR-R).

Eysenck Personality Questionnaire

There were significant negative correlations between male DRF projection scores 2 and 3 and female EPQ neuroticism, r = -.222, p = .030 and r = -.294, p = .004, respectively. The more similarly the men rated how they felt on the adjective

scales and how they thought women said men felt, the less neurotic women were on the EPQ. Also, the more similarly the men rated how they were and acted during the disagreement and how they thought their partners said they were and acted, the lower the women's neuroticism scores.

Interpersonal Problems (IIP)

There was a significant negative correlation between male DRF projection score 3 and male interpersonal problems. The more similarly men rated how they were and acted on the DRFQ and how they thought their partners were and acted, the lower the men scored on the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP), $r = -.324$, $p = .001$.

Global Severity Index (GSI) Scores on the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

There was a significant negative correlation between male DRF projection score 3 and the male global severity index. The more similarly men rated how they were and acted on the DRFQ and how they thought their partners were and acted, the lower were the men's Global Severity Index scores (GSI) on the Brief Symptom Inventory, $r = -.214$, $p = .036$.

Dyadic Satisfaction (ADAS)

There was a significant correlation between male DRF projection score 3 and both female relationship satisfaction and couple satisfaction. The more similarly men rated how they were and acted on the DRFQ and how they thought their partners were and acted, the higher were the women's relationship satisfaction scores on the Abbreviated Dyadic Adjustment Scale (ADAS) and the higher were the couple's scores on the ADAS, $r = .307$, $p = .002$ and $r = .268$, $p = .008$, respectively.

There was a significant correlation between male DRF projection score 1 and couple satisfaction at time 2. The more similarly men rated how they felt on the

adjective scales of the DRFQ and how they thought their partners felt, the higher were the couple's relationship satisfaction scores on the ADAS at time 2 (one year follow-up), r = .382, p = .020.

4.5.6.3 Female projection scores and other variables

The following is a review of the significant relationships between female projection scores and other variables such as dyadic satisfaction, attachment style, etc. For purposes of simplification, the three projection scores will be summarized in the same way as were the male scores, DRF projection scores 1 – 3.

ECR Anxiety and Avoidance

There was a significant negative correlation between female DRF projection score 2 and both men's anxiety and avoidance. The more similarly women rated how they felt on the adjective scales of the DRFQ and how they thought men said women felt, the lower the men's ECR anxiety and avoidance scores, r = -.253, p = .013 and r = -.339, p = .001, respectively.

There was a significant negative correlation between female DRF projection score 2 and both women's anxiety and avoidance. The more similarly women rated how they felt on the adjective scales of the DRFQ and how they thought men said women felt, the lower the women's ECR anxiety and avoidance scores, r = -.211, p = .039 and r = -.344, p = .001, respectively.

There was a significant negative correlation between female DRF projection score 1 and women's anxiety and avoidance. The higher the correlation between how women said they felt and how they thought their partners felt, the lower the women's ECR anxiety and avoidance scores, r = -.333, p = .001 and r = -.298, p = .003, respectively.

Psychological Mindedness

There was a significant correlation between female DRF projection score 2 and men's psychological mindedness. The more similarly women rated how they felt on the adjective scales of the DRFQ and how they thought men said women felt, the higher the men's scores were on the Psychological Mindedness Scale, r = .232, p = .023.

Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ)

There was a significant negative correlation between female DRF projection score 2 and women's psychoticism. The more similarly women rated how they felt on the adjective scales of the DRFQ and how they thought men said women felt, the lower were women's scores on the psychoticism scale of the EPQ, r = -.263, p = .010.

There was a significant negative correlation between female DRF projection scores 1 and 3 and women's neuroticism. The higher the correlation between how women said they felt on the adjective scales of the DRFQ and how they thought their partners felt, the lower women scored on the neuroticism scale of the EPQ, r = -.353, p = .000. Also, the more similarly women rated how they were and acted on the DRFQ vs. how they thought their partners said they were and acted, the lower women scored on the neuroticism scale of the EPQ, r = -.330, p = .001.

Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP)

There was a significant negative correlation between female DRF projection scores 1 and 3 and women's interpersonal problems. The more similar women's scores were between how they felt on the adjective scales of the DRFQ and how they thought their partners felt, the lower were women's scores on the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP), r = -.416, p = .000. Also, the higher the correlation between how women said they were and acted and how they thought their partners

said they were and acted, the lower were women's scores on the IIP, r = -.355, p = .000.

Dyadic Satisfaction (ADAS)

There was a significant correlation between female DRF projection score 1 and both men's and women's ratings of relationship satisfaction at times 1 and 2 and couple satisfaction at time 1. The more similarly women rated how they felt and how they thought their partners felt on the DRFQ, the higher were men's ratings of relationship satisfaction at time 1 and time 2, r = .223, p = .029 and r = .319, p = .006, respectively; the higher were women's ratings of relationship satisfaction at time 1 and time 2, r = .297, p = .003 and r = .354, p = .002, respectively; and the higher were the couple satisfaction scores at time 1, r = .279, p = .006.

There was a significant correlation between female DRF projection score 2 and both men's ratings of relationship satisfaction at time 1 and women's ratings of relationship satisfaction at times 1 and 2 and couple satisfaction at time 1. The more similarly women rated how they felt on the adjective scales of the DRFQ and how they thought men said women felt, the higher were men's ratings of relationship satisfaction at time 2, r = .280, p = .017; the higher were women's ratings of relationship satisfaction at time 1 and time 2, r = .286, p = .005 and r = .262, p = .026, respectively; and the higher were the couple satisfaction scores at time 1, r = .245, p = .016.

There was a significant correlation between female DRF projection score 3 and women's ratings of relationship satisfaction at time 1. The higher the correlation between how women said they were and acted on the DRFQ and how they thought men said they were and acted, the higher were the women's ratings of their relationship satisfaction at time 1, r = .235, p = .021.

4.5.6.4 DRFQ Scores and projection

In order to assess the relationship between DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores, regression analyses were conducted, to explore whether the extent of projection impacted the accuracy of dyadic reflective functioning.

Male and female DRF projection scores were used as the independent or predictor variables and the DRF accuracy scores as the dependent or criterion variables. The results provided overwhelming support for the case that the more individuals feel that they have in common with their partners and with what they think their partners think of them, the higher the DRF accuracy scores.

For the men, DRF projection scores significantly predicted DRF accuracy scores for three out of five of the DRF accuracy scores, just barely missing significance on the other two (see **appendices 4.5.181 – 4.5.182**). For the women, DRF projection scores significantly predicted DRF accuracy scores for three out of five of the DRF accuracy scores as well, barely missing significance for a fourth score (see **appendices 4.5.183 – 4.5.184**). The following are the results for these regressions for men and women respectively. Correlation matrices for DRF accuracy scores and DRF projection scores can be found in appendices 4.5.177 – 4.5.180. Correlations will not be discussed here, which again reflects the motivation to use multivariate statistics in the first place, taking into account all of the variables together versus looking at each one in isolation from the other.

Male DRFQ Scores and projection

A significant model emerged, using the enter method, predicting male DRF 1 (accuracy) from male and female DRF projection scores ($F_{6,89} = 3.072$, $p = .009$. Adjusted R square = .116). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 4.5.6.42: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male and female projection scores as predictor variables and male DRF 1 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*
Male Projection Score 1	.257	.038
Male Projection Score 2	.096	.410
Male Projection Score 3	-.030	.788
Female Projection Score 1	-.196	.141
Female Projection Score 2	.337	.002
Female Projection Score 3	-.147	.245

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting male DRF 2 (accuracy) from male and female projection scores ($F_{6,89} = 2.982$, $p = .011$. Adjusted R square = .111). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the table below:

Table 4.5.6.43: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male and female projection scores as predictor variables and male DRF 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*
Male Projection Score 1	.092	.452
Male Projection Score 2	.205	.082
Male Projection Score 3	-.012	.913
Female Projection Score 1	.359	.008
Female Projection Score 2	-.046	.666
Female Projection Score 3	-.175	.069

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting male DRF 4 (accuracy) from male and female projection scores ($F_{6,89} = 3.470$, $p = .004$. Adjusted R square = .135). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the table below:

Table 4.5.6.44: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male and female projection scores as predictor variables and male DRF 4 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*
Male Projection Score 1	.092	.452
Male Projection Score 2	.205	.082
Male Projection Score 3	-.012	.913
Female Projection Score 1	.359	.008
Female Projection Score 2	-.046	.666
Female Projection Score 3	-.175	.069

Female DRFQ Scores and projection

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting female DRF 2 (accuracy) from male and female projection scores ($F_{6,89} = 4.615$, $p = .000$. Adjusted R square = .186). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 4.5.6.45: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male and female projection scores as predictor variables and female DRF 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*
Male Projection Score 1	.147	.212
Male Projection Score 2	-.075	.502
Male Projection Score 3	.165	.122
Female Projection Score 1	-.126	.323
Female Projection Score 2	.410	.000
Female Projection Score 3	-.278	.024

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting female DRF 4 (accuracy) from male and female projection scores ($F_{6,89} = 2.702$, $p = ..019$. Adjusted R square = .097). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the table below:

Table 4.5.6.46: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male and female projection scores as predictor variables and female DRF 4 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*
Male Projection Score 1	-.091	.462
Male Projection Score 2	.185	.119
Male Projection Score 3	.076	.498
Female Projection Score 1	-.256	.057
Female Projection Score 2	.201	.066
Female Projection Score 3	.352	.007

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting male DRF 5 (accuracy) from male and female projection scores ($F_{6,89} = 2.925$, $p = .012$. Adjusted R square = .109). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the table below:

Table 4.5.6.47: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male and female projection scores as predictor variables and female DRF 5 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*
Male Projection Score 1	.047	.699
Male Projection Score 2	.309	.010
Male Projection Score 3	-.012	.913
Female Projection Score 1	.104	.437
Female Projection Score 2	.171	.115
Female Projection Score 3	-.106	.408

4.5.6.5 Gender differences in projection

Wilcoxon paired-sample testes were conducted for each of the three projection scores in order to assess if there were differences between men and women. There were no significant differences between men and women for any of the three projections scores (see **appendix 4.5.185**).

4.5.7 Summary of Results

DRF and other variables

Men and women who scored higher on the anxious and avoidant subscales of the revised Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR-R) were more "negative" about how they felt and how they thought their partners felt than those who were less anxious and avoidant.

Higher male avoidance scores on the ECR-R were associated with lower female DRF projection 2 scores. Higher female anxiety scores were associated with lower female DRF projection 1 scores. Higher female avoidance scores were associated with lower female DRF projection 1 and 2 scores.

Male standardized factor difference scores were predictive of female anxiety. Female standardized factor difference scores were predictive of female anxiety and avoidance.

Higher psychological mindedness scores for women were associated with higher DRF 4 scores, predicting how men said they were during the disagreement (the significance of this was reduced to $p < .05$ when controlling for projection).

Higher scores on the psychoticism scale of the EPQ-R S for women were associated with lower DRF projection 2 scores. Higher scores on the neuroticism scale of the EPQ-R S for women were associated with lower DRF projection 3 scores for men and lower DRF projection 1 and 3 scores for women.

Male standardized factor difference scores were predictive of male neuroticism scores on the EPQ-R S and female psychoticism scores on the EPQ-R S.

Women who scored higher on the IIP scored lower on DRF 4 scores of the DRFQ.

Higher interpersonal problem scores for men were associated with lower DRF projection 3 scores. Higher interpersonal problem scores for women were associated with lower DRF projection 1 and 3 scores.

Higher male scores on the ADAS at time 2 (one year following time 1) were associated with higher female DRF projection 1 scores. Higher female scores on the ADAS at time 1 were associated with higher male DRF projection 3 scores and higher female DRF projection 1 and 2 scores. Higher female scores on the ADAS at time 2 were associated with higher female DRF projection 1 scores. Higher combined couple scores on the ADAS at time 1 were associated with higher male DRF projection 3 scores and higher female DRF projection 1 scores.

Female standardized factor difference scores were predictive of couple dyadic satisfaction at time 2.

Male standardized factor difference scores were predictive of female global severity index scores on the BSI.

4.6 Discussion

4.6.1 Review of hypotheses and research questions

The following is a brief review of the hypotheses and research questions that were posed at the beginning of the chapter. The questions will be discussed in the following sub-sections according to the results already reported and the relevant theory that was expounded in the literature review in chapter one.

Attachment style security was predicted to be related to higher DRF accuracy scores based on results in the pilot study and findings in the reflective function literature. It was predicted that partners that were more in tune with each other would be more securely attached. It was predicted that variables such as length of

relationship, education, age and other demographics would not be related to performance on the DRFQ and that there would not be a difference between the sexes in their respective DRFQ scores. Higher DRF accuracy scores were predicted to be related to more relationship satisfaction and some exploratory analyses were conducted to see whether DRF scores predicted performance on variables such as interpersonal problems, attachment style, psychological symptoms and relationship satisfaction. Finally, it was predicted that DRF would be distinct from psychological mindedness and personality style, the latter as reflected in the revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire short form (EPQ-R S).

4.6.2 Attachment style and DRF

More anxious men and women were more negative about their own and their partners' feelings on the DRFQ. This replicates findings by Simpson et al. (1996) confirming attachment theory predictions that anxious-ambivalent and avoidant attached subjects perceived their partners and relationships in less positive terms after discussing a major problem.

Women who scored as more anxious and avoidant on the revised Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire (ECR-R) had higher accuracy scores on the DRFQ. The same did not apply to men whose anxiety and avoidance scores were not related to their performance on the DRFQ, though men whose partners were more anxious and avoidant more accurately predicted how their partners' felt during the disagreement. Though findings have been diverse and somewhat contradictory regarding gender performance in empathic accuracy, gender differences in empathic accuracy have been found with respect to attachment style. Simpson (1999), hypothesized that anxious-ambivalently attached people, in threatening situations, would be increasingly alert and aware of their partners' thoughts and feelings, thereby

demonstrating more empathic accuracy. He found that this was true for women, but not for men. Dugosh (1988) also found that anxious women demonstrated higher empathic accuracy. On the flipside, it was apparent that avoidant women demonstrated low empathic accuracy, but not avoidant men.

Fishtein et al. (1999) posited that anxious-ambivalent individuals, persistently seeking higher levels of intimacy and responsiveness in their relationship, would therefore be more prone to seek conflict as a means of achieving this goal. The authors found that in higher conflict relationships, anxious-ambivalent individuals were more likely than other individuals to hold knowledge about both positive and negative aspects of conflict, whereas all individuals were found to hold knowledge of negative aspects of conflict. According to Fishtein et al. (1999), these findings emphasize the importance of investigating interpersonal goals when evaluating the impact of interpersonal experiences. In another related study, the lower the interpersonal trust scores between members of a couple, the higher the empathic accuracy scores (Ickes, 2003).

The fact that more anxious women had higher DRF scores, and that this was not the case for men, reflects Simpson's (1999) findings. It is also interesting that men's DRF accuracy scores improved the more anxious and avoidant their partners were. It appears that women's anxiety and avoidance motivated men to try to better understand them, possibly as a defence against their anxiety and avoidance, or possibly because their anxiety and avoidance made them more predictable.

It is interesting that results in the pilot study revealed negative correlations between attachment insecurity and DRF scores, which corroborated findings in the Reflective Function literature. It was predicted that findings in the main study would corroborate these findings, but the opposite was true. Results in the main study point

to similar findings in the empathic accuracy literature where attachment style anxiety was associated with higher empathic accuracy. This has important implications for our work with couples and emphasises some fundamental differences regarding working with individuals versus working with couples. Some reasons for this distinction are explored in the following sub-section.

4.6.3 The RF Scale and DRF

According to Fonagy and Target (1997), the ability to read another's mind depends upon the attachment security of the individual, to feel secure enough in making attributions of mental states to account for the behaviour of the caregiver (Fonagy & Target, 1997). Just as secure individuals feel safe enough in making attributions of mental states, insecure individuals will be much more reluctant to do so. This is very much in contrast to the research findings in the empathic accuracy literature and in the present study. There are two very obvious reasons why this might be so. One more complex reason is that the DRFQ is a self-report measure and the RF scale is a coding system used in conjunction with the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI). But the empathic accuracy measure is based on a coding system as well. The fact that the DRFQ corroborates findings in the empathic accuracy literature with respect to attachment style demonstrates that there is more to this discrepancy than the self-report versus interview mediums.

A second crucial point of distinction between the RF scale and the empathic accuracy and DRFQ findings is that the latter two were applied to couple relationships, whereas the RF scale was originally applied to individuals reflecting on their childhood relationships with their parents. Whereas anxiety has been demonstrated to be a motivation for understanding one's partner in situations of

conflict with respect to empathic accuracy and the DRFQ in couple relationships, it represents something quite different in the context of the AAI.

4.6.4 Gender differences and DRF

Women and men differed in other respects as well in addition to the way their respective attachment styles were related to their DRF scores. Age was related to women's DRF 1 responses (if their partners were older), but not men's. Therapy was related to women's DRF 3 responses, but not men's. The ratings of parents' marital satisfaction was correlated with women's DRF 4 responses (based on their partners' ratings), but not men's. Level of education was related to women's DRF 4 responses, but not men's. The only demographic variable that was correlated with men's DRF scores was their ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, which was related to their DRF 1 scores.

Psychological mindedness scores were related to women's DRF 4 responses, but not to men's. Scores on the lying scale of the revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Short Scale were correlated with women's DRF 3 scores (based on their partners' ratings), but not with men's. Interpersonal problems scores were related to women's DRF 4 scores (based on their partners' ratings), but not to men's. Global severity index scores on the Brief Symptom Inventory were related to women's DRF 3 scores and DRF 4 scores (based on their partners' ratings), but not to men's.

Women's dyadic reflective functioning seems to be much more dependent on characteristics that their partners' have, but not vice versa. This is true with respect to male age and female DRF 1, men's ratings of their parents' marital satisfaction and female DRF 4, male attachment style avoidance and female DRF projection scores, male scores on the lying scale of the EPQ-R S and female DRF 3 scores, male

relationship satisfaction scores and female DRF projection scores and male global severity index scores and female DRF 4 scores.

For men, the same was true in only three instances: female attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male DRF 1 scores, female neuroticism scores on the EPQ-R S and male DRF projection scores and female relationship satisfaction scores and male DRF projection scores.

Male DRF scores that were based on standardized factor differences for the four factors of the three levels of meta-cognition were predictive of female anxiety, female psychoticism and female global severity index scores of the Brief Symptom Inventory. Female DRF standardized factor difference scores were not predictive of any variables for men. Female DRF standardized difference scores did however predict their own attachment style anxiety and avoidance and couple relationship satisfaction one year following completion of the original study.

There was also a considerable difference between men and women with respect to their DRF projection scores being related to variables such as attachment style and relationship satisfaction. There were a total of fourteen female DRF projection scores that were significantly related to attachment style, relationship satisfaction, personality style and interpersonal problems. For men, there were only four DRF projection scores that were related to personality style, interpersonal problems and relationship satisfaction.

Overall, in terms of the results on the various measures, it seems that women were much more influenced by men's personalities than men were by women's. On the whole, men are generally considered to be more avoidant and women to be more anxious. Generalizations such as these are simplifications of complex processes, but the largely unilateral impact that men seemed to have had on women's dyadic

reflective functioning more than likely reflects this more avoidant nature in men that renders them in many instances as more impermeable. Again, this is largely simplifying what is inevitably a very complex dynamic. The fact that men have manifest qualities of avoidant attachment and women have manifest qualities of anxious attachment reflects a collective and societal unconscious contract between the sexes and a classic example of the projective fit that exists in all couple relationships. On an unconscious level, the man lets the woman hold his anxiety and the woman lets the man hold her avoidance.

It was predicted that, similar to results from studies using the Reflective Function Scale (Fonagy et al., 1998), that there would be no difference between men and women in their respective performances on the DRFQ. This was clearly not the case in the present study. Gender takes on a much different significance when it is understood in the context of the couple rather than in the context of the individual. This was alluded to in the previous paragraph regarding how men and women share, or unconsciously possess certain traits or characteristics. The unconscious fit, which is a trademark of all couple relationships, makes it impossible to clearly distinguish between male and female in the context of the couple because what one might manifest might be present in the other latently. It is because of this very crucial point that the focus in couple work must be the couple and not the individual. A therapist who falls into the trap of being lured into believing that one member of the couple is very anxious while the other member of the couple is very avoidant because that is how they present themselves and because that is how they believe themselves to be, is colluding with the unconscious contract of the couple instead of fleshing it out and helping to make it more visible to the couple. Yin and Yang cannot exist without each other.

4.6.5 Education and the DRFQ

It appears that university educated women performed better on the DRFQ regarding their predictions of how their partners said they were during the disagreement than non-university educated women. This corroborates findings by Thomas et al. (1997) who found that more highly educated partners displayed higher empathic accuracy. They hypothesized that better educated people might produce greater empathic accuracy scores because better educated people might be smarter and more able to use information and make empathic judgments and be more motivated to concentrate on "problem-solving" discussion (Thomas et al., 1997). It is interesting that this was true in terms of behaviour, but not in terms of predicting feelings, and for women, but not for men.

It was predicted that level of education would not be related to performance on the DRFQ. The fact that women with more education had higher DRF 4 & 5 scores, which pertains to predicting how one's partner said he was and acted during the disagreement, is an important finding to keep in mind in terms of further use and development of the DRFQ. The DRFQ was not designed with a bias in mind regarding education or intelligence and purely theoretically speaking there should not be a difference in performance based on education and intelligence. It is interesting that this difference regarding education did not exist for example, with DRF 3 scores, which clearly appear to be the most complicated. There is however an important distinction between DRF 1 – 3 scores and DRF 4 & 5. This difference will be elaborated on further in the following sub-section.

4.6.6 Scoring of the DRFQ

4.6.6.1 Differences between DRF 1 – 3 scores versus DRF 4 – 5 scores

One important difference between the "feelings" sections of the DRFQ (DRF scores 1 – 3) and the "behaviour" sections (DRF scores 4 and 5) is that in the "feelings" sections, participants were asked to respond to what they thought their partners' felt, etc. versus in the "behaviour" sections where participants were asked to respond to how they thought their partners said they were or acted. In the latter, participants were explicitly asked to put themselves in their partners' shoes, whereas in the former, participants were asked for their own opinions regarding how their partners felt. All of the scores are reflections of accuracy, but it could be that asking people to implicitly suspend their own judgments and to try to think about how their partners responded taps into a skill that more educated people would be better at. It would be interesting to see whether these differences would still exist if participants were instead asked how they thought their partners were and acted. In other words, does the difference lie in what the participants were asked to do, or does it lie in the difference between thinking about feelings versus thinking about behaviour, or both? If participants were asked, for example, how they thought their partners said they felt, etc., would more educated people also have had higher scores?

4.6.6.2 Bonferroni corrections

In order to assess the relationship between DRF accuracy scores and demographic and other variables, the first step in the analysis involved performing correlations between the respective variables. A common method that is used to correct for performing a large number of correlations is the Bonferroni Correction (Bonferroni, 1935, 1936). There are pros and cons to using this conservative method. The pro, which is why this method is so important, is that the more correlations one

conducts, the more likelihood of achieving Type I errors, or falsely significant results. The downside in using Bonferroni Corrections is that you significantly increase the likelihood of achieving Type II errors, where meaningful significant results are eliminated (Perneger, 1998).

Due to the fact that this study is largely exploratory, the decision was made to reduce the p-values in the correlation analyses from the standard .05 to .01 and to perform additional multivariate analyses that take into account the performance of multiple operations. This was a decision that was made in order to avoid the elimination of meaningful results while simultaneously creating checks against false positives.

4.6.7 DRF and exploratory variables

A number of demographic and psychological variables were included in the study as exploratory variables such as age, ethnicity, whether participants were in therapy, ratings of parents' marital satisfaction, ratings of the happiness of the couple relationship compared to friends' relationships, self-rated IQ, interpersonal problems, personality type and psychological symptoms.

The fact that women who were in therapy had higher DRF 3 scores than women who were not in therapy is interesting because DRF 3 is clearly the most complex and confusing of the scores. It is possible that being in therapy made women better equipped to think about and reflect on such a complex example of meta-communication.

Whereas variables such as ethnicity and self-rated IQ were not related to DRF scores, variables such as the happiness of the relationship compared to friends' relationships were. It is interesting that the happier men rated their relationships compared to friends' relationships, the lower their DRF 1 scores and the higher

women's DRF 1 scores. It is possible that men's lower DRF 1 scores is a reflection of a more defensive rating of the happiness of their own relationship. Lower DRF 1 scores could then reflect an inability to reflect on the nature of their own relationship and on their partners' feelings.

4.6.8 DRF projection scores

4.6.8.1 DRF projection scores and relationship satisfaction

DRF projection scores appear to be very strongly related to relationship satisfaction, both at time one and upon follow-up one year later. This was true for both men and women, but more so for women. Also, male DRF projection scores were not related to their own relationship satisfaction scores, rather with female and combined couple scores. Female DRF projection scores on the other hand were positively correlated with male, female and couple relationship satisfaction scores. This strongly corroborates previous findings by Fletcher and Kininmonth (1992), who examined the relationship between attributions, or, projections, and marital satisfaction. They posited that there are compelling theoretical reasons to assume that there is a direct link between marital satisfaction and projection, successful relationships being associated with higher degrees of similarity between members of a couple.

4.6.8.2 DRF projection scores and other variables

DRF projection scores were also strongly correlated with less anxiety and avoidance, less psychoticism and neuroticism, lower interpersonal problems, less psychological symptoms and higher relationship satisfaction.

The fact that projection scores were found to be much more powerful predictors and correlates of variables such as relationship satisfaction and attachment style than were the DRF accuracy scores reflects similar findings in the empathic

accuracy literature. When one understands the limitations of "excessive" comprehension in the couple relationship, it furthers the understanding of the complexity of the couple. This, alongside the nature of the unconscious contract that exists in couple relationships, is an incredibly valuable lesson to learn regarding clinical work with couples. The goal should not necessarily be more accuracy in understanding in any given situation. A lack of understanding, especially in more vulnerable situations, has been demonstrated to be helpful in preserving the relationship. What does this imply in terms of the value of the DRFQ? It does not mean that one can deduce that higher DRF scores will be a positive for any couple in any given situation. It can however help to understand the couple fit and the couple dynamic. This brings us to an important sub-section regarding some of the limitations of the study.

4.6.9 Limitations of the study

Designing a measure is as complicated and frustrating as it is exciting and ambitious. The decision to create the DRFQ derived from the fact that this incredibly important and relevant concept (reflective function) had not been applied to couple relationships. Though measures exist that have been designed to assess communication in couple relationships and perspective-taking in couple relationships, no instrument has been developed to assess reflective functioning in the couple relationship. This was the justification for creating yet another psychological instrument.

4.6.9.1 Self-report versus interview

The debate about using self-report instruments to measure complex psychological constructs is not a new one. One argument against the use of self-report is that of social bias. This seems to have been avoided in the DRFQ because if

an individual marked that they felt positive feelings and acted positively out of fear of how they were going to be perceived, this would be reflected in the scoring, which is dependent upon the partner's responses.

There are obviously inevitable limitations of using self-report to assess unconscious processes. There is no access to physical behaviour, mannerisms, interaction, body language, etc. These are important things to look at when assessing what can broadly be classified as communication in couple relationships. Using videotaped interviews allows for coders to assess both body language and dialogue. The flipside is that interviews require exponentially more time, money and manpower. There is no doubt that an hour long videotaped interview will allow for a much more in-depth look into the couple relationship, but the DRFQ was designed as both a diagnostic tool and as a process and outcome-related instrument.

An unavoidable disadvantage in using self-report to assess dyadic reflective functioning is that there are situations that will inevitably not be representative of the couples' true functioning for various reasons, which will be expanded upon further in the following sub-section.

4.6.9.2 False positives and negatives

There are a number of situations and circumstances where false positive and/or negative scores might result concerning individuals' DRF accuracy. One false positive could occur for couples that are fused and cannot deal with difference in the relationship. This type of couple was presented in the introduction of chapter one. One would expect that their DRF accuracy scores would be quite high because they would both have similar responses and assume that the other had similar responses. The sameness of the couple would be reflected in high DRF accuracy scores, but does not really represent more cultivated dyadic reflective function.

Another inevitable confound with self-report is that people are confused and their answers do not reflect their feelings, or that they simply fill in random answers just to get it over with. It only takes one member of the couple to throw everything off. To counter this as much as possible, the primary investigator met with the majority of the participants personally and reviewed the instructions with them and encouraged them to ask questions. The vast majority of the couples that participated seemed to be genuinely interested in participating and in the research, but again, this clearly is not a guarantee.

The inverse of the first example, where a fused couple has high DRF accuracy scores that do not reflect the couple's true dyadic reflective capacity, is that a couple whose dyadic reflective functioning might actually be quite developed is not reflected in the DRFQ maybe because one of the partners was hesitant to characterize feelings as *extremely* where the other did, or because one had a headache and wasn't concentrating while participating, or because one of the members of the couple was less willing to participate than the other and took the process less seriously, etc. There are a myriad of possibilities why this might happen.

The important thing to consider when reflecting upon the false positives and negatives that will inevitably factor into the results is that the DRFQ was not developed as a diagnostic instrument to be used in isolation. It was developed to provide insight into the couple relationship at a given point in time. The only way to really get to know a couple and their unique dynamic is to really get to know the couple. The DRFQ was not designed to replace this, rather to enhance the therapeutic process and understanding and to try to operationalise and better understand the concept of reflective functioning in couple relationships.

4.6.9.3 DRF accuracy score 3

Three levels of metacognition were assessed in the DRFQ (DRF 1 – 3). The third level asked a man to respond as to what he thought she thought he said she felt and vice versa for the woman. There is no doubt that this is confusing. It was surprising how few people came to ask for clarification concerning this section. This could be that the instructions were very clear and people took the time to figure it out, or it could mean that people were tired by this point and filled in random responses, or were too ashamed to ask, etc. It is clear that DRF 3 was less reliable than DRF scores 1 and 2 based on test-retest reliability (see chapter 3), but there were some interesting results with DRF 3 scores and it seems it is definitely worth exploring.

4.6.9.4 Validity and reliability

Ideally, the RF scale by Fonagy et al. (1998) would have been used in addition to the DRFQ and other measures as a means of validating the DRFQ. This simply was not viable due to time, money and manpower. This would have involved adapting an interview and coding system to apply to couples and recruiting people who would have been willing to participate, in addition to transcribing and coding. This will be discussed further in the final chapter on future directions.

Originally, it was intended that 50% of the participating couples in the main study were going to be couples undergoing therapy at London Marriage Guidance. This turned out to be a difficult task for various reasons and the sub-sample of couples in therapy ended up being much smaller. It would have been interesting to have had 50% of couples in therapy to be able to explore differences between clinical and non-clinical samples on the DRFQ.

In the following chapter, the predictive validity of the DRFQ is assessed by measuring relationship satisfaction one year later in a random sample of couples who participated in the original study.

CHAPTER 5. A PREDICTIVE VALIDITY STUDY OF THE DRFQ AND RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION

5.1 Introduction

The complexity of the couple relationship with respect to the unconscious partitioning of traits and characteristics and the fact that more understanding can be a liability rather than an asset depending upon the couple and the situation has been discussed in the previous chapter with respect to relationship satisfaction and attachment style.

There have been conflicting findings in the empathic accuracy literature with respect to relationship satisfaction. There have been studies that have found that empathic accuracy and relationship satisfaction are related and there have been studies that have found the contrary. These studies have been reviewed in chapter one. It has also been found that projection or attribution is more predictive of relationship satisfaction than accuracy.

The importance of the third space, a reflective space, has also been discussed in chapter one. While it is understandable that couple relationships are complex and that there is such a thing as knowing too much, especially in more vulnerable situations, it seems that being able to understand and know one's partner's thoughts and feelings should be a fundamental component of relationship satisfaction. Given the findings in the reflective function literature regarding reflective function being the most powerful predictor of secure attachment, it is also quite feasible to hypothesise that dyadic reflective function will be predictive of relationship satisfaction.

The main aim in this study is to assess whether DRF accuracy and/or projection scores are predictive of relationship satisfaction and/or stability. In order to assess the predictive validity of the DRFQ over time, the Abbreviated Dyadic

Adjustment Scale (ADAS), which was included in the original battery of measures for marital adjustment/relationship satisfaction, was given to a random sample of couples (n = 37 couples) one year following their participation in the main study. An additional number of couples that did not participate in this follow-up did however respond as to whether or not they were still together (n = 71 couples, including couples who completed ADAS at time 2).

This study consists of two groups of analyses based on the two main questions being posed: 1) Did performance on the DRFQ predict whether or not couples remained together one year after completion of the original study? 2) Did performance on the DRFQ predict marital adjustment/relationship satisfaction one year after completion of the original study?

5.2 Methods

5.2.1 Design

As aforementioned, the following study contains two main sets of analyses. Analysis 1 consists of a multivariate binary logistic regression analysis. The dependent variable is couple relationship status (together, or not together). The covariates, in two separate groupings, are the five sets of scores for men and women derived from the Dyadic Reflective Functioning Questionnaire, DRF scores 1 - 5 (1st order correlation, 2nd order correlation, 3rd order correlation, how you think your partner said he/she was..., and how you think your partner said he/she acted during the disagreement) and the three male and female DRF projection scores. Correlations were run between relationship status and other variables such as interpersonal problems and attachment style and demographic variables, respectively, to identify additional variables to include in the analysis along with DRF projection and accuracy

scores. There were no significant relationships between relationship status and other variables (see **appendix 5.1**), or between relationship status and demographic variables (see **appendix 5.2**).

Analysis 2 consists of a multivariate linear regression analysis. The dependent variables are male, female and combined couple ADAS scores at time two, respectively. The independent variables are the same as for analysis 1 described above. Correlations were run between relationship satisfaction at time 2 and other variables and demographic variables, respectively, to identify variables to include in the analysis along with DRF projection and accuracy scores. Male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships were significantly correlated with male dyadic satisfaction at time 2 and combined couple ADAS scores at time 2, and male attachment style avoidance, male age and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships were significantly correlated with female dyadic satisfaction at time 2 scores (see **appendices 5.6 – 5.7** for men with other variables and demographic variables, respectively, and **appendices 5.8 – 5.9** for women with other variables and demographic variables, respectively).

5.2.2 Settings and Apparatus

Participants that agreed to participate in the follow-up completed the ADAS on their own time and in their own place.

5.2.3 Procedure

All of the couples who participated in the original study were emailed one year following their participation in the study and asked if they would be willing to participate in a short follow-up test via email where they would have to complete one of the questionnaires they completed originally at time one. Couples that did not

respond after a number of attempts were asked to respond as to whether or not they were still together.

One of the stipulations of study participation, as in the original study, was that it was necessary for both members of the couple to participate. Couples who agreed to participate were emailed the ADAS to their respective email addresses.

Participants were then instructed to sit separately to complete the questionnaires and to contact the primary investigator with any questions. Couples were told that the retest would take only five minutes to complete. No compensation was offered.

5.2.4 Subjects

Seventy-one of the original ninety-six dating, co-habiting and/or married couples that participated in the original study responded as to whether or not they were still together. Thirty-seven of the original ninety-six actually completed the ADAS at time 2. There were no couples that dropped out before completing, or during completion of the study.

5.3 Results

5.3.1 Relationship status

Of the 96 couples that participated in the original study, 72 responded one year later regarding their relationship status. Of the 72 couples that responded, 57 couples said that they were still together and 15 said that they had split up. The relationship status of the participating couples is represented in the following table as percentages:

Table 5.3.1: Relationship status of participating couples (n = 72) at time 2, one year following completion of the original study

Relationship Status	Percentage
Still Together	79%
Not Together	21%

Three series of logistic regression analyses were employed to predict the probability that a couple remained together or split up one year following participation in the original study. The predictor variables were male, female and combined couple DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores, respectively. Based on findings in chapter 4 of the present study regarding the relationship between attribution and relationship satisfaction, and similar findings in the empathic accuracy literature (Bradbury & Fincham, 1992), DRF projection scores were entered in block 1 of the analyses and DRF accuracy scores were entered in block 2 of the analyses.

For male DRF projection and accuracy scores as predictors of relationship status, the overall model was insignificant (Chi-square = 3.090, p = .929). Employing a .01 criterion of statistical significance, none of the predictor variables had significant partial effects (see **appendix 5.3**).

For female DRF projection and accuracy scores as predictors of relationship status, the overall model was insignificant (Chi-square = 6.055, p = .641). Employing a .01 criterion of statistical significance, none of the predictor variables had significant partial effects (see **appendix 5.4**).

For male and female combined DRF projection and accuracy scores as predictors of relationship status, the overall model was insignificant (Chi-square = 10.373, p = .846). Employing a .01 criterion of statistical significance, none of the predictor variables had significant partial effects (see **appendix 5.5**).

5.3.2 Male dyadic satisfaction at time 2

The relationship between male dyadic satisfaction at time two with other variables (ex. Attachment style, interpersonal problems, etc.) and demographic variables was assessed using Pearson's correlations (see **appendix 5.6 and 5.7**, respectively). There were three variables that were significantly correlated with male dyadic satisfaction at time 2 at, or below the .01 level: male ECR attachment style anxiety ($r = -.420$, $p = .010$), male ECR attachment style avoidance ($r = -.584$, $p = .000$) and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($r = .685$, $p = .002$).

Due to these findings the aforementioned variables that correlated significantly with male dyadic satisfaction at time 2 were entered in step 1 of the analysis. Due to findings in the main study and similar findings in the empathic accuracy literature, the DRF projection scores were entered in block 2 of the multiple regression analysis and the DRF accuracy scores were entered in block 3. Three separate analyses were conducted with male dyadic satisfaction at time 2 as the dependent variable, male attachment style anxiety and avoidance and ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships and male DRF projection and DRF accuracy scores, female DRF projection and DRF accuracy scores and combined couple DRF projection and DRF accuracy scores, respectively, as the predictor variables.

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting male dyadic satisfaction at time 2 from male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($F_{3,14} = 11.518$, $p = .000$. $R^2 = .712$). When male DRF projection scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{6,11} = 6.945$, $p = .003$. R

square change = .079, significance F-change = .296). Finally, when male DRF accuracy scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{11,6} = 4.452, p = .040$. R square change = .010, significance F-change = .449). Predictor variables with p-values less than .10 with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 5.3.2: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for male attachment style anxiety and avoidance scores and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, male DRF projection scores and male DRF accuracy scores as predictor variables and male relationship satisfaction at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Correlation between predictor variable and male ADAS at time 2	*P*
(Step 1)				
Male ECR anxiety	-.452*	.017	-.420**	.010
(Step 2)				
Male ECR anxiety	-.438*	.022		
(Step 3)				
Male ECR anxiety	-.387	.070		
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.531	.096	.685**	.002
Male DRF Score 1	.411	.079	.190	.261

$F = 11.518, p = .000$. $R^2 = .712$ for step 1. $F = 6.945, p = .003$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .079$ for step 2. $F = 4.452, p = .040$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .100$ for step 3.

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

All of the variables included in the analysis accounted for a total of 89.1% of the predictive variance for male dyadic satisfaction at time two. It is clear from the significance values of the respective F-changes from step 1 to step 2 and from step 2 to step 3 that neither male DRF projection scores nor DRF accuracy scores added significantly to the model. Combined, male DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 18% of the variance while male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships accounted for approximately 71% of the variance.

Following this analysis, an additional regression analysis was performed where the non-DRF significant variables were inputted in step 1 and the significant DRF scores were inputted in step 2. The purpose of this analysis was to see whether there was a significant F-change between non-DRF and DRF variables. In other

words, were any of the DRF scores crucial predictors of the respective criterion variables? In the case of male relationship satisfaction at time 2 and male variables, the significant non-DRF scores were male attachment style anxiety and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships. The significant DRF score(s) was male DRF 1. The non-DRF scores had an adjusted R^2 of .613. The adjusted R^2 after inputting the DRF score(s) was .684 with an F-change significance of .055, just barely missing significance at the .05 level. This tells us that male DRF 1 was an important predictor of male relationship satisfaction at time 2.

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting male dyadic satisfaction at time two from male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($F_{3,13} = 10.363, p = .001$. $R^2 = .705$). When female DRF projection scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{6,10} = 6.663, p = .005$. R square change = .095, significance F-change = .255). Finally, when female DRF accuracy scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{11,5} = 8.086, p = .016$. R square change = .147, significance F-change = .145). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the table below:

Table 5.3.3: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for male attachment style anxiety and avoidance scores and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, female DRF projection scores and female DRF accuracy scores as predictor variables and male relationship satisfaction at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Correlation between predictor variable and male ADAS at time 2	*P*
(Step 1)				
Male ECR anxiety	-.471*	.018	-.420**	.010
(Step 2)				
Male ECR anxiety	-.473*	.017		
Male ECR avoidance	-.549*	.036	-.584**	.000
Female Projection Score 3	-.662	.073	.312	.060
Female DRF Score 4	-.694*	.023	-.004	.980

$F = 10.363, p = .001$. $R^2 = .705$ for step 1. $F = 6.663, p = .005$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .095$ for step 2. $F = 8.086, p = .016$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .147$ for step 3.

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

All of the variables included in the analysis accounted for a total of 94.7% of the predictive variance for male dyadic satisfaction at time two. It is clear from the significance values of the respective F-changes from step 1 to step 2 and from step 2 to step 3 that neither female DRF projection scores nor DRF accuracy scores added significantly to the model though both female DRF 3 projection scores and female DRF 4 accuracy scores had p-values less than .1. Combined, female DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 25% of the variance while male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships accounted for approximately 70% of the variance.

Following this analysis, an additional regression analysis was performed where the non-DRF significant variables were inputted in step 1 and the significant DRF scores were inputted in step 2. In the case of male relationship satisfaction at time 2 and female variables, the significant non-DRF scores were male attachment style anxiety and avoidance. The significant DRF score(s) were female projection scores DRF 1 and 3. The non-DRF scores had an adjusted R^2 of .327. The adjusted R^2 after inputting the DRF score(s) was .330 with an F-change significance of .358, which is not significant. This tells us that female projection scores DRF 1 and 3 were not important predictors of male relationship satisfaction at time 2.

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting male dyadic satisfaction at time two from male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($F_{3,13} = 10.363$, $p = .001$. $R^2 = .705$). When male and female DRF projection scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{9,7} = 6.066$, $p = .013$. R square change = .181, significance F-change = .218). Finally, when male and

female DRF accuracy scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, there was an R square change of .114. Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the following table. Correlations between predictor variables and male relationship satisfaction at time 2 are not included in this table because they have already been reported in the previous tables:

Table 5.3.4: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male attachment style anxiety and avoidance scores and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, male and female DRF projection scores and male and female DRF accuracy scores as predictor variables and male relationship satisfaction at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*
(Step 1)		
Male ECR anxiety	-.471*	.018
(Step 2)		
Male ECR anxiety	-.450*	.024
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.392	.079

$F = 10.363, p = .001$. $R^2 = .705$ for step 1. $F = 6.066, p = .013$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .181$ for step 2. $F = N/A, p = N/A$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .114$ for step 3.

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

All of the variables included in the analysis accounted for a total of approximately 100% of the predictive variance for male dyadic satisfaction at time two. It is clear from the significance values of the respective F-changes from step 1 to step 2 and from step 2 to step 3 that neither male and female DRF projection scores nor DRF accuracy scores added significantly to the model. Combined, male and female DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 30% of the variance while male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships accounted for approximately 70% of the variance.

An additional analysis was not conducted for combined male and female DRF scores as predictors of male relationship satisfaction at time 2 because there were no significant DRF scores as predictor variables in the initial analysis.

5.3.3 Female dyadic satisfaction at time 2

The relationship between female dyadic satisfaction at time two with other variables (ex. attachment style, interpersonal problems, etc.) and demographic variables was assessed via Pearson's correlations (see **appendix 5.8 and 5.9**, respectively). There were three variables that were significantly correlated with female dyadic satisfaction at time two at, or below the .01 level: male ECR attachment style avoidance ($r = -.430, p = .008$), male age ($r = -.441, p = .006$) and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($r = .718, p = .001$).

Due to these findings the aforementioned variables that correlated significantly with female dyadic satisfaction at time two were entered in step 1 of the analysis. As with the previous set of analyses with male dyadic satisfaction at time 2, the DRF projection scores were entered in block 2 of the multiple regression analysis and the DRF accuracy scores were entered in block 3. Three separate analyses were conducted with female dyadic satisfaction at time two as the dependent variable, male attachment style avoidance, male age and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships and male DRF projection and DRF accuracy scores, female DRF projection and DRF accuracy scores and combined couple DRF projection and DRF accuracy scores, respectively, as the predictor variables.

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting female dyadic satisfaction at time two from male ECR attachment style avoidance, male age and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($F_{3,14} = 6.768, p = .005$. $R^2 = .592$). When male DRF projection scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, the model was insignificant ($F_{6,11} = 3.034, p = .053$. R square

change = .031, significance F-change = .820). Finally, when male DRF accuracy scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, the model was insignificant ($F_{11,6} = 3.964$, $p = .052$. R square change = .256, significance F-change = .144). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the table below as well as correlations between the predictor variables and female relationship satisfaction at time 2. As with the previous tables, only predictor variables with p-values less than .1 will be represented in the following tables:

Table 5.3.5: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for male attachment style avoidance scores, male age and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, male DRF projection scores and male DRF accuracy scores as predictor variables and female relationship satisfaction at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Correlation between predictor variable and female ADAS at time 2	*P*
(Step 1)				
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.468	.085	.718**	.001
(Step 3)				
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.659	.066		
Male DRF Score 5	-.387	.080	-.030	.862

$F = 6.768$, $p = .005$. $R^2 = .592$ for step 1. $F = 3.034$, $p = .053$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .031$ for step 2. $F = 3.964$, $p = .052$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .188$ for step 3.

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

All of the variables included in the analysis accounted for a total of 87.9% of the predictive variance for female dyadic satisfaction at time two. It is clear from the significance values of the respective F-changes from step 1 to step 2 and from step 2 to step 3 that neither male DRF projection scores nor DRF accuracy scores added significantly to the model though male DRF 5 had a p-values less than .1. Combined, male DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 28% of the variance while male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships accounted for approximately 60% of the variance. It is interesting that the male DRF

projection scores only accounted for 3% of the variance, while the male DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 25% of the total predictive variance.

Following this analysis, an additional regression analysis was performed where the non-DRF significant variables were inputted in step 1 and the significant DRF scores were inputted in step 2. In the case of female relationship satisfaction at time 2 and male variables, the significant non-DRF score(s) was male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships. The significant DRF score(s) was male DRF 5. The non-DRF scores had an adjusted R^2 of .485. The adjusted R^2 after inputting the DRF score(s) was .492 with an F-change significance of .286, which was not significant. This tells us that male DRF 5 was not an important predictor of female relationship satisfaction at time 2.

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting female dyadic satisfaction at time two from male ECR attachment style avoidance, male age and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($F_{3,13} = 6.127, p = .008$. $R^2 = .586$). When female DRF projection scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{6,10} = 6.894, p = .004$. R square change = .220, significance F-change = .048). Finally, when female DRF accuracy scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, the model was insignificant ($F_{11,5} = 3.709, p = .080$. R square change = .086, significance F-change = .602). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 5.3.6: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for male attachment style avoidance scores, male age and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, female DRF projection scores and female DRF accuracy scores as predictor variables and female relationship satisfaction at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Correlation between predictor variable and female ADAS at time 2	*P*
(Step 2)				
Male ECR avoidance	-.586*	.028	-.430**	.008
Male ECR age	-.389*	.041	-.441**	.006
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.459	.058	.718**	.001
Female Projection Score 1	.631*	.045	.329*	.047
Female Projection Score 3	-1.091**	.008	.262	.117

$F = 6.127, p = .008$. $R^2 = .586$ for step 1. $F = 6.894, p = .004$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .220$ for step 2. $F = 3.709, p = .080$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .086$ for step 3.

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

All of the variables included in the analysis accounted for a total of 89.1% of the predictive variance for female dyadic satisfaction at time two. It is clear from the significance values of the respective F-changes from step 1 to step 2 and from step 2 to step 3 that female DRF projection scores added significantly to the model, whereas female DRF accuracy scores did not add significantly to the model. Combined, female DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 30% of the variance while male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships accounted for approximately 59% of the variance. It is interesting that the female DRF projection scores accounted for approximately 22% of the variance, while the female DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately only 8% of the total predictive variance. This is the inverse of the results with male DRF scores where their DRF projection scores accounted for much less of the predictive variance for female dyadic satisfaction at time two than male DRF accuracy scores.

Following this analysis, an additional regression analysis was performed where the non-DRF significant variables were inputted in step 1 and the significant DRF scores were inputted in step 2. In the case of female relationship satisfaction at time 2 and female variables, the significant non-DRF scores were male attachment

style avoidance, male age and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships. The significant DRF score(s) were female projection DRF 1 and 3. The non-DRF scores had an adjusted R^2 of .504. The adjusted R^2 after inputting the DRF score(s) was .723 with an F-change significance of .012, just barely missing significance at the .01 level. This tells us that female projection DRF 1 and 3 scores were important predictors of female relationship satisfaction at time 2.

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting female dyadic satisfaction at time two from male ECR attachment style avoidance, male age and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($F_{3,13} = 6.127, p = .008. R^2 = .586$). When male and female DRF projection scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{9,7} = 5.090, p = .022$. R square change = .282, significance F-change = .130). Finally, when male and female DRF accuracy scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, there was an R square change of .133. Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the following table. Correlations between predictor variables and female relationship satisfaction at time 2 are not included in this table because they have already been included in the previous tables:

Table 5.3.7: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male attachment style avoidance scores, male age and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, male and female DRF projection scores and male and female DRF accuracy scores as predictor variables and female relationship satisfaction at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
(Step 2) Male ECR age	-.474*	.029
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.514*	.048
Female Projection Score 1	.758	.053
Female Projection Score 3	-.1224**	.010

$F = 6.127, p = .008. R^2 = .586$ for step 1. $F = 5.090, p = .022. \blacktriangle R^2 = .282$ for step 2. $F = N/A, p = N/A. \blacktriangle R^2 = .133$ for step 3.

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

All of the variables included in the analysis accounted for a total of approximately 100% of the predictive variance for female dyadic satisfaction at time 2. It is clear from the significance values of the respective F-changes from step 1 to step 2 and from step 2 to step 3 that neither male and female DRF projection scores nor DRF accuracy scores added significantly to the model. Combined, male and female DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 41% of the variance while male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships accounted for approximately 59% of the variance.

An additional analysis was not conducted here because there were no new variables to input as significant predictors of female relationship satisfaction at time 2.

5.3.4 Couple dyadic satisfaction at time 2

The relationship between combined couple dyadic satisfaction at time two with other variables (ex. attachment style, interpersonal problems, etc.) and demographic variables was assessed via Pearson's correlations (see **appendix 5.10 and 5.11**, respectively). There were three variables that were significantly correlated with combined couple dyadic satisfaction at time 2 at the .01 level: male ECR attachment style anxiety ($r = -.423, p = .009$), male ECR attachment style avoidance ($r = -.530, p = .001$) and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($r = .731, p = .001$).

The three variables that were significantly related to combined couple dyadic satisfaction scores at time two were entered into block 1 of the multiple regression analyses. The DRF projection scores were entered in block 2 of the analyses and the DRF accuracy scores were entered in block 3. As with male and female dyadic satisfaction, three separate analyses were conducted with combined couple dyadic

satisfaction at time 2 as the dependent variable and male DRF projection and DRF accuracy scores, female DRF projection and DRF accuracy scores and combined couple DRF projection and DRF accuracy scores, respectively, as the predictor variables in addition to male attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships.

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting combined couple dyadic satisfaction at time two from male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($F_{3,14} = 9.914, p = .001$. $R^2 = .680$). When male DRF projection scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{6,11} = 4.416, p = .016$. R square change = .027, significance F-change = .802). Finally, when male DRF accuracy scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{11,6} = 4.641, p = .036$. R square change = .188, significance F-change = .190). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the table below. Only predictor variables with p-values less than .1 will be included in the following tables:

Table 5.3.8: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for male attachment style anxiety and avoidance scores and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, male DRF projection scores and male DRF accuracy scores as predictor variables and combined couple relationship satisfaction at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Correlation between predictor variable and couple ADAS at time 2	*P*
(Step 1)				
Male ECR anxiety	-.389*	.043	-.423**	.001
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.438	.054	.731**	.001
(Step 2)				
Male ECR anxiety	-.380	.078		
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.473	.080		
(Step 3)				
Male ECR avoidance	.177	.592		
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.603	.063		
Male DRF Score 1	.548*	.028	.303	.068

$F = 9.914, p = .001$. $R^2 = .680$ for step 1. $F = 4.416, p = .016$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .027$ for step 2. $F = 4.641, p = .036$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .188$ for step 3.

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

All of the variables included in the analysis accounted for a total of 89.5% of the predictive variance for combined couple dyadic satisfaction at time 2. It is clear from the significance values of the respective F-changes from step 1 to step 2 and from step 2 to step 3 that neither male DRF projection scores nor DRF accuracy scores added significantly to the model though male DRF 1 had a p-value less than .1. Combined, male DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 22% of the variance while male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships accounted for approximately 68% of the variance. It is clear again with respect to male DRF scores that the male DRF projection scores only accounted for 3% of the predictive variance whilst the male DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 19% of the predictive variance.

Following this analysis, an additional regression analysis was performed where the non-DRF significant variables were inputted in step 1 and the significant

DRF scores were inputted in step 2. In the case of combined couple relationship satisfaction at time 2 and male variables, the significant non-DRF scores were male attachment style anxiety male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships. The significant DRF score(s) was male DRF 1. The non-DRF scores had an adjusted R^2 of .620. The adjusted R^2 after inputting the DRF score(s) was .742 with an F-change significance of .013, just barely missing significance at the .01 level. This tells us that male DRF 1 was an important predictor of combined couple relationship satisfaction at time 2.

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting combined couple dyadic satisfaction at time two from male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($F_{3,13} = 8.815, p = .002$. $R^2 = .670$). When female DRF projection scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{6,10} = 7.739, p = .003$. R square change = .152, significance F-change = .090). Finally, when female DRF accuracy scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, the model was insignificant ($F_{11,5} = 4.519, p = .054$. R square change = .086, significance F-change = .527). Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the following table:

Table 5.3.9: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values and correlations for male attachment style anxiety and avoidance scores and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, female DRF projection scores and female DRF accuracy scores as predictor variables and combined couple relationship satisfaction at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	*P*	Correlation between predictor variable and couple ADAS at time 2	*P*
(Step 1)				
Male ECR anxiety	-.397	.051	-.423**	.009
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.427	.070	.731**	.001
(Step 2)				
Male ECR anxiety	-.399*	.028		
Male ECR avoidance	-.476*	.050	-.530**	.001
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.488*	.025		
Female Projection Score 1	.506	.081	.288	.084
Female Projection Score 3	-.845*	.022	.302	.069
(Step 3)				
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.457	.078		

$F = 8.815, p = .002$. $R^2 = .670$ for step 1. $F = 7.739, p = .003$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .152$ for step 2. $F = 4.519, p = .054$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .086$ for step 3.

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

All of the variables included in the analysis accounted for a total of 90.9% of the predictive variance for combined couple dyadic satisfaction at time two. It is clear from the significance values of the respective F-changes from step 1 to step 2 and from step 2 to step 3 that neither female DRF projection scores nor female DRF accuracy scores added significantly to the model though both female DRF projection scores 1 and 3 had p-values less than .1. Combined, female DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 24% of the variance while male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships accounted for approximately 67% of the variance. It is interesting that the female DRF projection scores accounted for 15% of the variance, while the male DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately only 9% of the total predictive variance.

Following this analysis, an additional regression analysis was performed where the non-DRF significant variables were inputted in step 1 and the significant

DRF scores were inputted in step 2. In the case of combined couple relationship satisfaction at time 2 and female variables, the significant non-DRF scores were male attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships. The significant DRF score(s) were female projection DRF 1 and 3. The non-DRF scores had an adjusted R^2 of .611. The adjusted R^2 after inputting the DRF score(s) was .750 with an F-change significance of .028, significant at the .05 level. This tells us that female projection DRF 1 and 3 scores were important predictors of combined couple relationship satisfaction at time 2.

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged predicting combined dyadic satisfaction at time two from male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships ($F_{3,13} = 8.815, p = .002$. $R^2 = .670$). When male and female DRF projection scores were added in step 2 of the analysis, a significant model emerged ($F_{9,7} = 4.406, p = .032$. R square change = .180, significance F-change = .334). Finally, when male and female DRF accuracy scores were added in step 3 of the analysis, there was an R square change of .150. Predictor variables with their respective standardized Beta coefficients and p-values are shown in the following table. Correlations between predictor variables and couple relationship satisfaction at time 2 are not included in this table because they have already been represented in the previous tables:

Table 5.3.10: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male attachment style anxiety and avoidance scores and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships, male and female DRF projection scores and male and female DRF accuracy scores as predictor variables and combined couple relationship satisfaction at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
(Step 1)		
Male ECR anxiety	-.397	.051
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.427	.070
(Step 2)		
Male ECR anxiety	-.374	.076
Male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships	.560*	.038
Female Projection Score 3	-.845	.054

$F = 8.815, p = .002$. $R^2 = .670$ for step 1. $F = 4.406, p = .032$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .180$ for step 2. $F = N/A, p = N/A$. $\blacktriangle R^2 = .150$ for step 3.

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

All of the variables included in the analysis accounted for a total of approximately 100% of the predictive variance for combined dyadic satisfaction at time two. It is clear from the significance values of the respective F-changes from step 1 to step 2 and from step 2 to step 3 that neither male and female DRF projection scores nor DRF accuracy scores added significantly to the model. Combined, male and female DRF projection scores and DRF accuracy scores accounted for approximately 33% of the variance while male ECR attachment style anxiety and avoidance and male ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' relationships accounted for approximately 67% of the variance.

An additional analysis was not conducted here because there were no new significant predictor variables.

5.4 Discussion

It was hypothesised that DRF accuracy would be predictive of relationship stability and satisfaction. This, despite the fact that in findings in the current study and similar findings in the empathic accuracy literature, DRF accuracy scores and empathic accuracy scores respectively, were not related to relationship stability and/or satisfaction because sometimes, as aforementioned, accuracy actually hurts. DRF projection scores on the other hand, especially for women, were found to be significantly correlated with relationship satisfaction and similar findings have been reported in the empathic accuracy literature.

5.4.1 DRF accuracy and relationship satisfaction

Neither male nor female DRF accuracy scores were predictive of more relationship stability for couples, but higher male DRF 1 accuracy scores were significant predictors of both male and combined couple relationship satisfaction at time 2. The more accurately men were able to predict how women felt at time 1, the happier the men were at time 2. It is interesting that the more in tune men were with their partners predicted their own relationship satisfaction versus that of their partners. Why might this be so? One possible interpretation is that the higher male DRF 1 scores reflected them being and feeling more in tune with their partners. This in turn was related to the men feeling more satisfied in their relationships. This is an encouraging sign considering that many of the findings have been women-related. It demonstrates that though there are clearly differences between men and women that there are important aspects of dyadic reflective function for men. Female DRF accuracy scores on the other hand were not predictive of relationship satisfaction at time 2.

Might there be disadvantages to knowing too much? According to Ickes (2003), "there are circumstances in which not knowing the other's thoughts and feelings, *not* being empathically accurate, is preferable to the alternatives (226). In some cases, it has been demonstrated that greater empathic accuracy can actually increase conflict and dissatisfaction in a relationship (Ickes, 1985). Simpson and Ickes (1999) hypothesized that couples display low levels of empathic accuracy where each partner's thoughts and feelings are potentially threatening to the other partner's view of the relationship. The authors went even further and hypothesized that low empathic accuracy in threatening situations would actually preserve the relationship. They found that not accurately predicting each other's thoughts and feelings actually enabled couples to protect their relationships from long-term damage (Simpson et al., 1999). According to Ickes (2003), "research findings suggest that for the average relationship partner, the motive to avoid unpleasant realities is stronger than the motive to confront them" (243).

These findings have very important implications with regards to couple therapy. It is largely counterintuitive to assume that greater empathic accuracy, or higher dyadic reflective functioning could be damaging to a couple relationship, but it seems quite clear that this could very well be the case. It is also fairly safe to assume that for many therapists that work with couples, that greater empathic accuracy, or higher dyadic reflective functioning might be one of the goals of the therapy. In many cases, it would probably be beneficial and serve the couple quite well. But it seems to be the case that this depends upon the couple and the situation. A couple that is very vulnerable might not be able to contain "knowing too much", and a well-intentioned therapist blind to this could easily do more harm than good.

5.4.2 DRF projection scores

Neither men's nor women's DRF projection scores were predictive of relationship stability at time 2, but women's DRF projection scores 1 & 3 added significantly to the logistic regression model in predicting their own relationship satisfaction whereas their DRF accuracy scores accounted for much less of the variance and did not significantly add to the model. For women as opposed to men, it did not matter how accurate they were in interpreting their partners' feelings in terms of their own relationship satisfaction. The more similarly women believed their men felt to them and the more similar they felt in relation to what they thought men said women felt, the happier the women were at time two. Male DRF projection scores were not predictive of relationship satisfaction for either men or women.

It is interesting that men and women differed in this way in terms of their relationship satisfaction. For men, being more in tune with their partners was more important. For women, feeling more similar to their partners was more important. This is a fascinating difference that might have very interesting implications for working with couples. It also highlights one of the major challenges in working with couples. Not only is every person different, but men and women are very different animals with different needs. The complicated nature of the collective unconscious contract between men and women has been discussed in previous chapters, which points to the fact that these generalized differences that exist do not exist solely because men and women are hardwired differently. Rather, just as on a microscopic level with individual couples, there is an unconscious fit that inevitably entails projections of unwanted feelings and certain roles that each member of the couple adapts, on a macroscopic level, it can be argued that there is a collective unconscious fit between men and women, which differs according to culture, society and time, that

also entails projections of unwanted feelings and an assignment of roles. For example, if one sees a couple sitting in a café having a heated discussion, it would probably not be much of a surprise to see the woman crying. But if the man was crying it would probably strike a chord inside us, not that it is wrong for the man to be crying, but that it is more out of place. This collective contract is very much present in the consulting room. If one member of the couple feels dragged along and would rather be someplace else, it is almost invariably always the man who is playing that role. The bottom line is that it is understandable in light of all of this that there are gender differences in dyadic reflective function and it makes sense that this is true in the context of the couple where it was not true in the context of the individual regarding male and female reflective function with respect to the primary caregiver.

There is an important point to clarify with respect to these feelings that are represented by the adjective sections of the DRFQ. Similar ratings between partner and self do not necessarily represent identical feelings during the disagreement. Feelings and emotions are obviously way too complex to boil down to nineteen descriptive adjectives. It might be fairer and more accurate to say that a higher correlation between 'self' and 'other' represents a feeling of a shared experience rather than a feeling of inhabiting two very different islands with no bridge to cross. For example, if partner 1 says she felt extremely annoyed and frustrated during the disagreement and believes partner 2 was not at all annoyed and frustrated, one could interpret that partner 1 felt frustrated that partner 2 was not engaged in the disagreement. This might be an example of an anxious/avoidant couple. Or, more obviously, if partner 1 felt very optimistic during the disagreement, but believed partner 2 was very pessimistic, this does not point to much hope at resolving the disagreement as a unit.

Why is projection/attribution such a powerful predictor of relationship satisfaction? First of all, it is important to elaborate on what is being referred to as projection/attribution. In terms of the scoring on the DRFQ, projection/attribution refers to two things: the extent to which one rated one's partner's feelings during the disagreement similarly to their own, and the extent to which one thinks one's partner rated one's own feelings similarly to how one rated one's own feelings.

This is not necessarily projection, though it very well could be. It is not projection if one genuinely feels one's partner was experiencing the disagreement in a similar way to oneself. It is not necessarily projection if the similarity is corroborated by one's partner. It is important to note that it still could be projection even if the partner corroborates the responses. There is simply no way to truly distinguish one from the other. It might be helpful to break projection/attribution down into sub-categories: 1) One attributes one's own feelings to one's partner and one's partner actually feels quite differently. 2) One attributes one's own feelings to one's partner and one's partner corroborates this attribution because he/she says he/she feels quite similarly. 3) One rates one's partner's feelings quite differently from how one rated oneself.

Clearly, the most straightforward example of projection is example number one. Example number two is more nebulous and example number three is an example of not projecting. These three sub-categories were not distinguished from one another in the scoring and it did not matter whether one's partner corroborated the ratings or not in terms of the relationships with relationship satisfaction, anxiety, avoidance, etc. What mattered was one's own belief that their partner was experiencing something similar and that one thought one's partner thought one felt similarly to what one said he/she felt him/herself.

5.4.3 Limitations of study

There are some inevitable limitations regarding the nature of self-rated satisfaction, and one which was discussed in chapter 4 of the present study. A fused couple might rate their relationship satisfaction very high, but this might evince a shared defence as much as, or more than, genuine satisfaction. This same fused couple would probably have also rated themselves very similarly. So they would have escaped the radar of the DRFQ as a type of false positive. Another example of high DRF projection scores not necessarily being "positive", is if both members of the couple are "on the same page", but totally miserable, pessimistic, annoyed and frustrated, anxious, etc. This so-called false-positive would hit the radar because it would be reflected in the low relationship satisfaction ratings. These examples highlight the complexity of the couple fit and the fact that these scores, while useful as inference and interpretive markers, as aforementioned, cannot possibly be unequivocal diagnoses.

In the following chapter, five couples that presented for therapy with the primary investigator were selected to participate in a study where there difficulties were explored in the context of the DRFQ. The participating couples took the DRFQ at the end of their respective therapies. The process and outcome of their respective therapies are explored alongside their DRFQ accuracy and projection scores.

CHAPTER 6. QUALITATIVE EXPLORATION OF COUPLE PERFORMANCE ON THE DYADIC REFLECTIVE FUNCTIONING QUESTIONNAIRE (DRFQ)

6.1 Introduction

One of the main aims in the creation of the DRFQ was to create an easy to administer, time efficient measure that could be utilized in a clinical context, primarily for process and outcome research. In the previous chapters, a series of quantitative analyses were performed in order to assess the test-retest reliability of the DRFQ, its discriminant and concurrent validity, construct validity, predictive validity as well as a series of exploratory analyses. In order to see how high and low scorers on the DRFQ differ in their presentation, a qualitative analysis was conducted with five couples that presented for therapy with the primary investigator. Details on the subjects and the procedure will be discussed further in the following section.

In the present chapter, as aforementioned, responses on the DRFQ are analysed and explored for five couples that were in couple therapy with the primary investigator. DRF accuracy and projection scores are analysed in the context of the respective couples' presenting problems in the therapy, process of therapy and how members of the couples experienced each other and their respective differences.

Why is it important to integrate qualitative with quantitative analysis? According to Bryman (2001), multi-method research involves using more than one type of research technique or approach to explore an issue. The rationale behind multi-method research is that it would enhance the confidence of any findings and compensate for the weakness of any one research design (Bryman, 2001).

Greene et al. (1989) suggested that integrating qualitative and quantitative methods is useful in order to gain more insight and information on results achieved

through an initial approach, to identify contradictions in findings via multiple sources and/or to achieve convergence of results (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989).

Duffy (1987) proposed that triangulation, or using more than one type of research technique, has a number of benefits including the use of case studies to demonstrate the effectiveness of statistical models (Duffy, 1987).

Hammersley (1996) outlined three approaches to multi-method research: 1) Triangulation, where one method is used to corroborate the results of another. 2) Facilitation, where one method facilitates the other. 3) Complementarity, where two methods are used to explore different facets of a particular problem (Hammersley, 1996).

According to Dixon-Woods et al., (2004), little has been written as to when it is appropriate to integrate qualitative and quantitative research, but inferences can be drawn from the literature on multi-method research that integrating qualitative and quantitative methods can be effective in generating hypotheses and research questions, selecting the variables to be studied, informing sampling and providing explanations and informing conclusions (Dixon-Woods, Agarwal, Young, Jones, & Sutton, 2004).

The qualitative exploration in the present study would probably be classified as triangulation according to Hammersley's (1996) classifications, where clinical case studies are being used to corroborate the quantitative analyses performed in the previous chapters, echoing Duffy's (1987) proposal concerning the effectiveness of using case studies to demonstrate the effectiveness of statistical models.

The main question in this chapter is whether the DRFQ is useful in differentiating and/or identifying couples with high or low scores. How do these

couples present in therapy and how do DRF scores reflect the therapy process and outcome?

6.2 Methods

6.2.1 Design

The present study is a qualitative exploratory study of a small group of five couples whose DRF accuracy and projection scores are analysed and interpreted in the context of their respective therapeutic processes and outcomes.

6.2.2 Setting and apparatus

Participating couples completed the DRFQ in the consulting room with the primary investigator present.

6.2.3 Subjects

Five couples participated in the present study. The five couples that were selected presented for therapy with the primary investigator. All five couples agreed to participate and were not offered any compensation. More details on the participants can be found in tables 6.2.1 and 6.2.2:

Table 6.2.1: Subject demographics for participants

	Age	Occupation	Marital Status	Ethnicity	Length of relationship	Children	DRFQ Issue
Sam*	45	Engineer	Married	Caucasian	5 years	0	Communication
Mindy*	39	Writer		Caucasian			
Alex*	33	Artist	Co-habiting, but not married	Caucasian	1 year	0	Trust
Zoe*	40	Artist		Caucasian			
Rob*	43	Builder	Married	Caucasian	10 years	1	Warmth and affection in relationship
Lara*	36	Mother		Caucasian			
Gabe*	28	Masseuse	Dating	Caucasian	5 years	0	Friends
Talia*	24	Advertisement		Latin			
Dan*	29	Student	Married	Caucasian	3 years	0	Friends
Judy*	29	Therapist		Latin			

*** All names, ages and professions have been changed to maintain anonymity**

Table 6.2.2: Joint sessions attended, presenting problems and therapy outcomes for participating couples

	# of sessions	Presenting problem	Therapy outcome
Sam Mindy	55	Communication. Not feeling understood. Wanting to work through issues before starting a family	Better understanding of their communication patterns and defences
Alex Zoe	6	Trust. Affair	Very short joint work, which was too short to accomplish anything though individual work was much more effective
Rob Lara	70	Wanting affection and love. Not feeling accepted and appreciated by each other	Much better understanding and acceptance of vulnerabilities and couple fit, but therapy cut short by birth of baby
Gabe Talia	45	Trust. Neediness. Issues of dependency	Therapy cut short by male. Advances in understanding projective system
Dan Judy	20	Friends	Helpful in identifying and exploring their unconscious fit and dealing with each other's differences

6.2.4 Procedure

As aforementioned, five couples that presented for couple therapy with the primary investigator were asked if they would be willing to participate in a study on communication in couple relationships. All five couples were asked if they would be willing to participate in the study at the beginning of the treatment. They were told that all that it entailed was the completion of a self-report questionnaire upon termination.

Four of the five couples that were selected were chosen because they presented with serious attachment-related issues. These four couples presented with

low relationship satisfaction, but they all seemed to want to try to better understand and work through their difficulties. The fifth couple that was selected presented with a much more secure attachment. They appeared to have a much healthier system of communication. This fifth couple was selected in order to see whether their DRF scores differed substantially from the other four couples.

The couples were told that the therapy was not going to be significantly altered because they were participating in the study and that if they felt uncomfortable for whatever reason, or if they had any questions or concerns, that they were encouraged to express them.

Subjects were given the DRFQ upon termination because it was part of the study design not to know the scores at the beginning of the therapy. It was not possible to administer the DRFQ at the beginning of therapy because if an insufficient amount of time elapsed between time 1 and time 2, there would have been an issue of the DRF scores being confounded with memory. It was therefore decided that the subjects would be given the DRFQ upon termination, so both the subjects and the therapist/primary investigator were blind to the results during the therapeutic process.

The following case descriptions are accompanied by tables containing the respective participants' DRF accuracy and projection scores and their respective quartile rankings compared to subject scores in the main study. The quartile rankings are labelled next to each score in the following manner:

* 1st quartile (top 25%)
** 2nd quartile
*** 3rd quartile
**** 4th quartile (bottom 25%)

6.3 Description of cases

Sam and Mindy

Sam, 45, white/British, was an engineer. He was soft-spoken and anxious. He often closed his eyes when he spoke. There was an anxiety about him, which was not aggressive, but he had a tendency to get overwhelmed by situations and completely lose control. He was a binge drinker when he drank and often found himself in compromising situations. When the counselling began, he had not been drinking and did not seem to find it too difficult to abstain. His mother died when he was young and his father was a violent alcoholic. He was raised by a series of housekeepers and nannies until he was old enough to look after himself.

Mindy, 39, white/British, worked as a freelance writer. She had a tight protective exterior. She often came in wrapped up in a scarf and jacket and usually kept the scarf on as though she was protecting herself from the world. She had a dry sense of humour and tended to try to make light of things. She had quite an aggressive and defensive manner of relating and she often looked as though she was on the verge of tears, even though I don't think she was. I also don't think she was at all aware of the defensive manner in which she reacted to criticism.

Treatment setting and duration

Mindy and Sam attended once weekly therapy at the Tavistock Centre in North London. They attended joint couple sessions for 15 months, approximately 55 sessions, at which point Sam continued with individual sessions for an additional six months.

Performance on the DRFQ

Sam's DRF accuracy scores were quite high while Mindy's DRF accuracy scores were quite low compared to Sam's. This could reflect Sam's more anxious

attachment and corroborates findings from the present study as well as similar findings in the empathic accuracy literature. Mindy's lower scores could be interpreted in light of her more avoidant attachment style and defensive manner of relating. Sam was much more thoughtful and able to reflect on his actions during the sessions. As aforementioned, Mindy was quite rigid and protected in the sessions. Mindy's avoidant attachment style and low DRF accuracy scores also corroborated findings in the empathic accuracy literature regarding lower accuracy for avoidant attached individuals.

Both Sam and Mindy's DRF projection scores were low to mid range. I wouldn't have expected their DRF projection scores to be high, which seems to be significantly positively associated with more relationship satisfaction.

Overall, both Sam and Mindy's performances on the DRFQ reflected their respective attachment styles and intuited reflective capabilities. I would have been surprised if Mindy had high DRF accuracy scores, but I was not surprised at all that Sam's DRF accuracy scores were quite high. I also did not expect either of their DRF projection scores to be high, though I did not expect them to be as low as they might have been at the start of the therapy. See tables 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 for details on Sam and Mindy's DRF accuracy and projection scores, respectively, as well as means and standard deviations for the DRF accuracy and projection scores from the larger sample discussed in chapter (n = 96 couples):

Table 6.3.1: DRF accuracy scores for Sam and Mindy and the respective means and standard deviations derived from the participants in the main study discussed in chapter 4 (n = 96 couples)

	DRF 1	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 2	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 3	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 4	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 5	Mean (S.D.)
Sam	1.09*	.44 (.29)	.30***	.40 (.37)	.82*	.46 (.31)	1.72*	.42 (.37)	1.22*	.31 (.36)
Mindy	.57**	.39 (.36)	.89*	.53 (.33)	.03****	.39 (.39)	.52**	.38 (.41)	.91*	.32 (.32)

*** 1st quartile ** 2nd quartile ***3rd quartile ****4th quartile**

Table 6.3.2: DRF projection scores for Sam and Mindy and the respective means and standard deviations derived from the participants in the main study discussed in chapter 4 (n = 96 couples)

	DRF 1 Projection	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 2 Projection	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 3 Projection	Mean (S.D.)
Sam	.71**	.49 (.39)	.78**	.69 (.41)	-.27****	.34 (.34)
Mindy	.39***	.50 (.43)	1.29*	.78 (.41)	-.12***	.30 (.41)

*** 1st quartile ** 2nd quartile ***3rd quartile ****4th quartile**

Presenting problem

Neither Sam nor Mindy were able to name or clearly express what their issues were. They were planning on starting a family, but wanted to work on communication issues where they felt criticized and misunderstood by each other. They both felt a bit stuck. They had first gotten together ten years previously and she broke off the relationship after two years. Five years later she orchestrated a meeting and they immediately started dating again. Basically, they both felt it was important to try to deal with this hazy issue of communication before taking the plunge into parenthood. Based on their presenting problem, I would have predicted both Sam and Nancy's DRF accuracy scores to have been quite low given that both Sam and Nancy felt misunderstood by each other.

The boundaries between Sam and Mindy were extremely blurry, especially in situations of disagreement. When one of them felt stressed about something, the other inevitably became overwhelmed as though it was his/her stress. There was a very strong sense of entanglement, not knowing who was feeling what and why. Whenever Sam got upset about something, Mindy felt she had to try to make it better even though Sam told her that was not what he needed. It made him feel misunderstood. She claimed that she often forewent disagreeing with him about something, because the ensuing conflict was not worth it, because he got very condescending when she disagreed with him.

Therapeutic process

Sam and Mindy had trouble challenging each other in the sessions. They were much more comfortable telling narratives without having to enter into what was going on between them. The subject of dealing with difference was at the epicentre of the work with Sam and Mindy. They had quite a bit of trouble disagreeing with each other. But their trouble was more related to the boundary issue discussed earlier. They either completely disagreed, thereby putting up quite rigid defences against each other, or they melded into one, where it was difficult to tell whose feelings were whose. This fusion as a defence against dealing with difference has been discussed in previous chapters and is a red flag for possible false-positive results on the DRFQ, because accuracy can be due to a false sense of sameness versus true understanding. Sam and Mindy vacillated between fusion and total difference, but this changed as the therapy progressed. They were able to identify and understand this pattern as defensive behaviour, which opened them up to being more reflective and in turn feeling more understood be each other. It is for this reason that I would not expect that either of their DRF accuracy scores are false positives, especially because they took the DRFQ at the end of their joint therapy.

They had a flight into health fantasy about a month or so into therapy. She said that things had been quite quiet at home and she thought a lot of it was because Sam had changed since coming to counselling. He came alone the following session because she had a work commitment. He brought up the drinking as something to talk about. I told him I wondered if he wanted to talk about that in order to avoid dealing with his relationship with Mindy. I thought it was something they had done consistently and it was much easier to deal with a concrete issue such as drinking then to deal with hazier relationship issues. We talked about how hard it was for them to

disagree and that when they had disagreements he often told her "you're going to leave me". She broke off the relationship in the past and this vulnerability was obviously still an important issue for him. They were both terrified of being abandoned. If disagreeing was associated with leaving, it made it a lot more complicated to be able to assert separateness by maintaining their respective opinions.

In the following sessions, the theme of stress and disagreements and blurring of boundaries was dealt with further. Mindy said that growing up she always had to be aware of how her mother was feeling, to be able to read her moods in order to know how to act. So her needs and her mother's needs were inevitably inextricably bound. Sam and Mindy needed to be able to start withdrawing projections in order to create some sort of space between them and to let some boundaries form.

Therapeutic outcome

The joint work with Sam and Mindy ended after approximately 15 months because she was six months pregnant and wanted to attend yoga classes. Sam stayed on in therapy for another year. The therapy helped Sam and Mindy to be much more aware of their projective system, which allowed for the formation of clearer boundaries between them, which in turn made disagreeing much less explosive, confusing and dangerous.

The DRFQ was an incredibly useful foundation for exploring Sam and Mindy's couple fit. In their case, the issue of communication and understanding each other was at the core of their problems. Working with their defences against understanding each other allowed for the development of the third space that is essential if dyadic reflective function is to exist.

Rob & Lara

Rob, 43, was a white, British builder. Rob came from a military family and grew up in boarding school. He was planning on following in his father's footsteps by pursuing a military career, but problems with his eyesight eventually prevented him from pursuing this path.

Lara, 36, was a full-time mother. She presented as "hippyish". She was also white and British. Lara grew up in boarding school as well. She maintained that she had a close relationship with her parents, both of whom had battled with depression at various points in their lives.

Treatment setting and duration

Rob and Lara attended once weekly therapy at the Tavistock Centre in North London. They attended joint couple sessions for 18 months, approximately 70 sessions.

Performance on the DRFQ

Rob and Lara completed the DRFQ at the end of their therapy. Rob's DRF accuracy scores were considerably lower than Lara's DRF accuracy scores. This is interesting due to the complex nature of their attachment. In the case of Rob and Lara, their scores on the DRFQ would lead one to infer based on previous findings that Lara was the more anxiously attached partner and Rob was the more avoidant partner, because of the relationship between anxious attachment and greater empathic accuracy and higher dyadic reflective function. This is in fact how they presented, though their manifest attachment styles also reflected a projective system where each was holding feelings that the other was unable to own.

Rob's DRF projection scores were also considerably lower than Lara's DRF projection scores. This is not surprising considering the relationship between DRF

projection and relationship satisfaction. Though both Rob and Lara were unsatisfied for their respective reasons, Rob was clearly the more dissatisfied.

Between their DRF accuracy and projection scores, Rob and Lara's performances on the DRFQ reflected their personalities, attachment styles and interpersonal dynamic. See tables 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 for details on Rob and Lara's DRF accuracy and projection scores, respectively, as well as means and standard deviations for the DRF accuracy and projection scores from the larger sample discussed in chapter (n = 96 couples):

Table 6.3.3: DRF accuracy scores for Rob and Lara and the respective means and standard deviations derived from the participants in the main study discussed in chapter 4 (n = 96 couples)

	DRF 1	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 2	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 3	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 4	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 5	Mean (S.D.)
Rob	1..14*	.44 (.29)	.16***	.40 (.37)	.23****	.46 (.31)	1.46*	.42 (.37)	.20***	.31 (.36)
Lara	.89*	.39 (.36)	1.05*	.53 (.33)	.58**	.39 (.39)	1.30*	.38 (.41)	.39**	.32 (.32)

*** 1st quartile ** 2nd quartile ***3rd quartile ****4th quartile**

Table 6.3.4: DRF projection scores for Rob and Lara and the respective means and standard deviations derived from the participants in the main study discussed in chapter 4 (n = 96 couples)

	DRF 1 Projection	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 2 Projection	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 3 Projection	Mean (S.D.)
Rob	.71**	.49 (.39)	.21****	.69 (.41)	.27***	.34 (.34)
Lara	1.01*	.50 (.43)	1.40*	.78 (.41)	.67*	.30 (.41)

*** 1st quartile ** 2nd quartile ***3rd quartile ****4th quartile**

Presenting problem

Both Rob and Lara described their parents' relationships as bully-victim relationships; similar to the way they presented themselves (he being the bully). They both claimed that they did not want to repeat this pattern in their relationship (especially she).

She felt he did not give her any affection. They both claimed that they brought out the worst in each other. He said in the first session that he was bored with their domestic existence and routines. Their whole life revolved around activities for

their son. He said she was perfectly content with a domestic lifestyle and that that was all that she wanted. He said in the first session that they were not in love anymore. She said she was still in love with him. He felt she was needy and the more demanding she got for attention, the less attractive she became. She felt his whims and fancies about wanting to move to different places were immature and irresponsible. They both felt unmotivated and had been stuck in the same pattern for a number of years.

He presented as a classic avoidant individual, fiercely independent and feeling weighed down by domesticity and routine. He was frustrated by the fact that their entire life revolved around their child's schedule. She presented as anxiously attached, in a position where she was constantly seeking love and affection from him. This made her feel unattractive and unloved. Lara's high DRF accuracy scores probably reflect a need to know what Rob was thinking, rather than a more empathic understanding that is rooted in a secure attachment. Rob's comparatively low DRF accuracy and projection scores reflect his avoidance, which was rooted in very profound vulnerabilities concerning abandonment and rejection.

Therapeutic process

Rob vocalized his frustration with the focus of attention that was placed on their son. He said in the first session that every time he called home from work to speak with Lara, she started speaking with Billy (their son), and didn't pay attention to him. He prided himself on being fiercely independent his whole life, a loner and a rebel who was never really able to fit in. This persona seemed to fit quite well with the unsatisfied adventurer who disdained the banality of domestic existence. Yet underneath he was more understatedly expressing other needs, which he was not prepared to own at the time, needs for attention and affection. Rob seemed to be

expressing a difficulty in moving from a twosome to a threesome. The extreme need for independence he was expressing was probably in large part a defence against a very powerful unconscious need to be loved. Rob's difficulty in moving from a twosome to a threesome corroborates his avoidant attachment and low DRF accuracy scores. He felt very threatened by his son, but was completely unaware of it.

Lara was constantly seeking love and affection. She was also not shy about making it known that she was never getting what she wanted. She said she felt powerless and unattractive, but she seemed quite willing and capable of expressing herself, and she definitely did not transmit a victim persona to me, but rather quite a powerful passive-aggressive personality. She let him know he didn't give her affection and love, and he felt like a failure. I could see from the very beginning that, though they were quite far away from each other, they were involved in a dance of distance whose moves and rhythms were unflappable.

They were playing strictly defined roles in their relationship and it was obvious that these roles were defences against core vulnerabilities. They seemed to have been quite practiced in these roles and felt stuck and frustrated by having to repeat the same dance over and over again. Even though they were sick and tired of dancing the same dance day after day, it is what they were most comfortable with, and they danced it like Ginger Rogers and Fred Astaire. This unconscious fear and unwillingness to relinquish what was simultaneously consciously so incredibly frustrating presented a formidable challenge to the therapy.

What seemed to be most profoundly missing in their relationship was a secure base, and the safety that results from the fact that both individuals know that they are wanted and cared for and that it is safe to express differences and to be autonomous and intimate at the same time. They repeatedly entered into discussions, which

normally concerned a recent disagreement, and the same pattern always seemed to occur. When either of them expressed a need, usually it was she who expressed needs/wishes/desires; it seamlessly turned into one or the other being attacked for their differences.

The lack of a secure base in their relationship stifled the ability to think in some critical ways. What resulted was a collusion of withholding whereby neither party gave the other what they needed. In terms of their dance, it meant that any attempt at improvisation was shunted. The steps were mapped out and colour-coded.

Lara's major complaint was that Rob did not make her feel loved or needed or attractive. She repeatedly said things like, "if only you hugged me last night...or, why don't you ever tell me that you love me?" When discussing this dynamic in a supervision group, a very powerful image came to my mind of her with a dicer, chopping off little bits of his penis every time she expressed his failure to meet her needs. In other words, she was playing an equal part in this withholding of love, affection, dependency and security. She made him feel like nothing he did was good enough, and he made her feel that he could not and would not give her the things that she needed. Their supposed needs were made explicit over and over again, quite clearly, yet this murkiness, this inability to think, persisted.

Colman claims that "good-enough containment" entails, amongst other things, the acceptance that the tension between autonomy and couplehood will persist as long as one is part of a couple. This touches on a theme that is central to attachment theory, the fact that different individuals have different comfort levels, thoughts and behaviours regarding attachment to others. Much of what contributes to an individual's working model of attachment derives from his/her history with primary caregivers and subsequent attachment relationships.

Byng-Hall (1985) regards the balance of intimacy and autonomy as the basis of a creative marriage. When safety is threatened, this balance is inevitably thrown off and anxiety about intimacy may well be triggered. He calls this the "too-close, too-far" potential where the "marriage becomes stuck at a particular distance, the proverbial 'ten-foot pole' marriage. If either of the partners turns away from the other, cues are set up that will pull them back. If they turn toward each other and try to achieve some intimacy, however, the barriers will go up, and they will push one another away" (2).

This characterization of the 'ten-foot pole' marriage fit Rob and Lara to a tee. It excited me because I thought it was an incredibly accessible way to characterize their dance and to explore it with them. When they started in therapy, her main complaint was his distance and lack of affection. It was still her main complaint months later, but she became pregnant, which was one very concrete way of dealing with too much distancing. At the same time, any time Rob did something that could have been viewed as a positive move toward intimacy, Lara expressed her disappointment that it wasn't good-enough, and the dicer was activated, which, if it could speak would have said: "You are getting too close. Assume the position. Dance the dance".

Therapeutic outcome

We eventually began to explore how Rob and Lara might have been able to express their individual needs to each other in a way that was not as threatening as it had been in the past, without attacking each other. Rob had an issue about needing space. Sometimes he felt that he needed space for whatever reason, but he never told Lara that he needed some time to himself. Instead, he got in a bad mood, and it turned into a situation where she felt rejected and he felt frustrated, and neither of

their needs was met. We explored how they might have been able to start to express these things to each other, and that that didn't mean that they would never fight anymore, but at least they could give themselves a chance to have a need; express it, and have it be fulfilled.

The flipside of this is interesting to think about. Not being able to express their needs to each other in a way that was not damaging or dangerous was also a way of sabotaging their own needs. If one does not believe one can get what one wants, or that one deserves what one wants, one might unconsciously do things to prevent the wish from coming true. In the case of Lara, the way that she pursued affection from Rob was producing the reverse effect of what she supposedly wanted. In the case of Rob, the way he was pursuing his desire for space ended up further embroiling them in conflict and moving further away from what he supposedly wanted, also producing the reverse effect.

Rob and Lara stopped coming to therapy after about a year and a half, shortly before the birth of their second son. They were both wary of terminating, but there was definitely much more of a sense of safety and security in the relationship. Rob had a stable full-time job, which made him feel much more empowered. They were both aware of how they made each other feel vulnerable and insecure, and they were both willing to own responsibility for their behaviour.

It would have been interesting to have seen their DRF scores at the beginning of therapy. I would suspect that they would have been even more extreme than they were upon termination. I think that their DRF scores accurately reflect that though they were more aware of their dynamic and defences, that they were both still feeling quite vulnerable and the coming birth of their baby, which was the reason for terminating the therapy, could have been interpreted as a way to avoid further

intimacy and vulnerability. As in Sam and Mindy's case, the DRFQ was a very useful base for exploring Rob and Lara's unconscious fit.

Alex & Zoe

Zoe, 40, had been coming for individual therapy for nine months because she was having an affair with Alex and felt overwhelmed by guilt and indecision and confusion regarding what she should do with her husband, also named Alex. Working with Zoe was quite frustrating. Her life was like a soap opera. By the end of the therapy, Zoe had decided to end the relationship with her husband, Alex, and to pursue a relationship with the other Alex. It actually felt like quite a big accomplishment given the fact that for years, Zoe had always been entrenched in threesome type relationships loaded with deception. She genuinely seemed to want to stop this and to be with Alex (2), who she loved, and with whom she felt she could be open and honest.

Only a few months after Zoe had stopped coming to therapy, I received a message that she wanted to come to see me with Alex (2). I agreed and we met for the first time in the early spring. Zoe was much more quiet and reserved than she was when she came on her own. They appeared as an anxious-avoidant couple, but Zoe was the avoidant and Alex the anxious. He was very likeable. Also an artist, Alex had recently had a bit of success and he earned a sizeable chunk of money, which upset the previous balance, where they were both starving artists. They met at a workshop. The affair was deeply clandestine because Zoe's husband, Alex (1), was also involved in the art world and it was a small, tight-knit community where everyone knew everyone.

Treatment setting and duration

Alex and Zoe attended once weekly therapy at the Tavistock Centre in North London. She attended individual sessions for 9 months. They then attended six sessions together after which Alex continued with individual sessions for six months.

Performance on the DRFQ

Alex and Zoe completed the questionnaires just before Alex started coming to see me on his own. Alex's DRF accuracy scores were much higher than Zoe's scores, which once again can be seen to reflect Alex's anxious attachment being associated with more DRF accuracy and Zoe's avoidant attachment reflecting less accuracy.

Alex's DRF projection scores were much higher than Zoe's scores, which were quite low. Alex seemed to be much more invested in the relationship and to feel much more like he was part of a couple than Zoe.

As with the other couples discussed previously, Alex and Zoe's responses and performances on the DRFQ seem to quite accurately reflect their respective attachment styles and reflective capacities. See tables 6.3.5 and 6.3.6 for details on Alex and Zoe's DRF accuracy and projection scores, respectively, as well as means and standard deviations for the DRF accuracy and projection scores from the larger sample discussed in chapter (n = 96 couples):

Table 6.3.5: DRF accuracy scores for Alex and Zoe and the respective means and standard deviations derived from the participants in the main study discussed in chapter 4 (n = 96 couples)

	DRF 1	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 2	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 3	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 4	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 5	Mean (S.D.)
Alex	.13****	.44 (.29)	1.40*	.40 (.37)	1.22*	.46 (.31)	.96*	.42 (.37)	.18***	.31 (.36)
Zoe	.93*	.39 (.36)	.55**	.53 (.33)	.64**	.39 (.39)	.93*	.38 (.41)	.00****	.32 (.32)

*** 1st quartile ** 2nd quartile ***3rd quartile ****4th quartile**

Table 6.3.6: DRF projection scores for Alex and Zoe and the respective means and standard deviations derived from the participants in the main study discussed in chapter 4 (n = 96 couples)

	DRF 1 Projection	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 2 Projection	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 3 Projection	Mean (S.D.)
Alex	.71**	.49 (.39)	1.05*	.69 (.41)	.60*	.34 (.34)
Zoe	.37***	.50 (.43)	.59***	.78 (.41)	.30**	.30 (.41)

*** 1st quartile ** 2nd quartile ***3rd quartile ****4th quartile**

Presenting problem

Even though the "threesome" was over, problems were sprouting up in the relationship. Alex was very tearful from the beginning. He couldn't get over the fact that she cheated on him while they were having an affair. While he was completely aware that they were betraying Alex (1), he thought they were madly in love and was shocked and destroyed even though Zoe's fling was just a one-time thing. Alex found out about it because he read her emails. He felt ashamed of it, but he said that he couldn't resist it.

It felt like a reversal of the sexes. He was not feminine at all, but he was very connected to his emotions. It was clear that he was carrying a double-dose of the emotions in the relationship. Zoe seemed to find Alex's "feminine side" to be quite unattractive. Though she looked like a deer in the headlights, she consistently attacked Alex's vulnerability. It seemed clear to me that Zoe did not want to be with either Alex, but that she couldn't stand to be alone.

After only six sessions together, Zoe was ready to dump Alex off onto me. She felt as though she was the enlightened one having been in therapy and that it was obvious from Alex's display of uncontrollable emotions that he really needed the help. I tried to keep the couple together, but to no avail. Alex continued on with me on his own for over six months, terminating when I left the UK.

Therapeutic process & outcome

The joint work obviously comprised a small percentage of the therapy. I felt like even though Zoe ended her relationship with her husband, I became the third man in the relationship. Zoe felt even more impenetrable to me in the couple work than in the individual work. I felt that there was a profound inability for her to be honest. She was pure false self.

In the six sessions of joint work, the "affair within the affair" was the main issue that was discussed. Zoe repeated that she felt terribly guilty about it and that she didn't deserve to be with Alex, but it all sounded so hollow, like she was lost in a role and couldn't find her way out. Zoe seemed to long to be alone yet simultaneously to not know how and to be terrified of it.

Alex wavered between feeling like he might have been able to forgive Zoe for her transgression and feeling like he couldn't. It was clear that the honeymoon was over and that I was going to be left to pick up the pieces.

I would have expected Zoe's DRF accuracy scores to have been quite low, but I would attribute higher scores to the fact that she needed to know what Alex was thinking and feeling at all times to be able to be in complete control. Her avoidance was symptomatic of this need to be in complete control. I felt that we made very little headway in understanding this in the joint work. The fact that most of my work with Alex and Zoe was on an individual basis reflected the inability to accept a "third" in their relationship. Exploring their fit in the context of the DRFQ brought this difficulty to light.

Gabe & Talia

Gabe was in his mid thirties. He had long hair, which he kept in a ponytail and a short and scruffy looking beard. He was very "hippyish" in his appearance. His father left his mom when Gabe was a child, and Gabe said that he pretty much left being a father as well. Since Gabe was the oldest, his mom started treating him more like a replacement husband than a son. She was very dependent on him. She was needy and fragile and burdened him with all of her problems.

Talia was in her late twenties from Latin America. She had described her parents as religious and conservative and very close. Talia said that growing up, she was always trying to get her father's attention. He was always busy and never really emotionally available. Her mother, on the other hand, was extremely doting and involved. When Talia sat down to eat, her mom was always there, preoccupied that she was going to enjoy it. It sounded like her mom had a very fragile sense of self and lived vicariously through her children. Talia's father sent her to London when she was eighteen to go to university. She didn't want to leave, but was pressured by her father to do so. She ended up staying because she met Gabe when she was finishing university and she got a job in advertising where she was working when they came for therapy.

Treatment setting and duration

Gabe and Talia attended once weekly therapy at the Tavistock Centre in North London. They attended joint couple sessions for 9 months, approximately 45 sessions.

Performance on the DRFQ

Gabe and Talia completed the DRFQ in their last week of therapy. They both had relatively high DRF accuracy scores, which might be a reflection of their shared

anxiety and their shared need to know what the other was thinking as a means of self-preservation.

Gabe's DRF projection scores were quite low, much lower than Talia's. This might indicate the fact that Talia expressed much more commitment to the relationship than did Gabe who always had one foot out the door. See tables 6.3.7 and 6.3.8 for details on Gabe and Talia's DRF accuracy and projection scores, respectively, as well as means and standard deviations for the DRF accuracy and projection scores from the larger sample discussed in chapter (n = 96 couples):

Table 6.3.7: DRF accuracy scores for Gabe and Talia and the respective means and standard deviations derived from the participants in the main study discussed in chapter 4 (n = 96 couples)

	DRF 1	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 2	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 3	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 4	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 5	Mean (S.D.)
Gabe	1.31*	.44 (.29)	.71*	.40 (.37)	1.19*	.46 (.31)	.73*	.42 (.37)	.39**	.31 (.36)
Talia	.40**	.39 (.36)	.94*	.53 (.33)	.62**	.39 (.39)	.49**	.38 (.41)	1.13*	.32 (.32)

*** 1st quartile ** 2nd quartile ***3rd quartile ****4th quartile**

Table 6.3.8: DRF projection scores for Gabe and Talia and the respective means and standard deviations derived from the participants in the main study discussed in chapter 4 (n = 96 couples)

	DRF 1 Projection	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 2 Projection	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 3 Projection	Mean (S.D.)
Gabe	.52**	.49 (.39)	.36****	.69 (.41)	.53**	.34 (.34)
Talia	.99*	.50 (.43)	.91**	.78 (.41)	.35**	.30 (.41)

*** 1st quartile ** 2nd quartile ***3rd quartile ****4th quartile**

Presenting problem

Gabe and Talia had been together for five years. They said that they were hesitant about coming because things had been going well for the past few weeks. I asked them why they came. She said she was very anxious about his having female friends and was always anxious about what he would do. I asked them if there was a reason for that. He said yes. He said he had a "fling" on vacation a year ago. Talia said that that whole experience was extremely painful for her. It felt as though someone had died. She said she didn't want to go through that again.

Gabe emphasized that it wasn't that he was hopping from one girl to another, but they were having problems in their relationship. He said she was very possessive. She never wanted him to have a life outside of their relationship and that she didn't make much of an attempt with his family and friends. She said that she felt left out by him and that his mom was rude to her and he never stuck up for her. His friends were very cliquish and it felt very hard to penetrate. She always felt like an outsider trying to get in. She said he was never very committed in the relationship. Before this fling, jealousy wasn't much of an issue as much as her feeling he wasn't there for her.

Gabe and Talia manifested a classic avoidant-anxious dynamic that was similar to that of Rob and Lara's in the sense that this extreme dynamic represented a shared defence against some very early fears of intimacy and feelings of vulnerability. They were both repeating patterns in their relationships with their opposite sex parents. I think that Gabe's very high DRF accuracy scores represented his need to be in complete control. Though he presented as an avoidant, he was absolutely terrified of being abandoned again the way his father abandoned him when he was young.

Therapeutic process

One of the greatest challenges in my work with Gabe and Talia was to maintain the focus on the couple and to provide a container for the couple; a couple comprised of two individuals who ran away at any hint of intimacy. Gabe and Talia had a very anxious-avoidant dynamic, where one was always in the needy role and the other was either running away or attacking the other's dependence. Gabe played the avoidant role most of the time and Talia the anxious, but these were roles made for reversing. In part, Gabe chose Talia because she did not represent the threat that his mother posed, which was impinging and overwhelming.

Talia found in Gabe a strong and distant and remote male figure, quite similar to that of her father. Talia spent her childhood trying to find a way to penetrate her father's emotionally distant and conservative exterior. He became like an impenetrable statue, impossible to crack, idealized and revered. Gabe and Talia's dynamic permitted Talia to continue to try to get inside. In doing so, Talia's role was overtly needy and dependent and penetrative, much like the role of Gabe's mother, which he was supposedly trying to avoid in Talia. Their fit meant that Talia's demands would trigger the impingements of Gabe's mother and would send him running, and Gabe's vulnerability would be attacked because it was a departure from Talia's strong and remote father. This was a dynamic that precluded the possibility of intimacy and provided an intense challenge to my attempts at forming a container for the couple.

The challenge of providing a container for the couple manifested itself in the countertransference. I went through a number of phases with Gabe and Talia. In the first phase, which lasted for the first couple of months, they drew me in. I was intent on identifying with them, especially with him, despite the fact that Gabe had done abominable things. This changed when I took the couple to my supervision group. Gabe disgusted them. They attacked him and I felt foolish for being so taken in by him. I had been colluding with the couple by avoiding dealing with issues of intimacy and it seemed that my colleagues were reacting to both Talia's and my inability to deal with the couple's attacks on intimacy. The floodgates were blown open. I went from identification to castigation. I went on the attack and I became quite critical and challenging of them in the following sessions.

In the so-called second phase that I entered with Gabe and Talia, as aforementioned, I took on the role of both her disapproving father and of his overly

critical and dismissing mother. Anything that Gabe said made me suspicious that he was concocting thoughts and ideas that were not representative of how he really felt if he felt anything at all. I became frustrated with them both and my frustration paradoxically created more of a couple between them than when I was colluding with their attacks on intimacy.

Therapeutic outcome

Gabe and Talia and I spent quite a bit of time in the sessions looking at their projections. This primarily revolved around Gabe's inability to deal with his own neediness and vulnerability. Talia being the "needy and dependent" one in the relationship, at least on a manifest level, was a complicated amalgam of her re-enacting her own relationship with her father, plus taking on the projected bits of Gabe's relationship with his mother, and the repressed neediness and vulnerability that he had never integrated surrounding being abandoned by his father.

Gabe eventually decided that it was time to terminate the therapy against both my advice and Talia's wishes. Talia felt very insecure about stopping. She felt that it was the only space that they were able to communicate constructively. The fact that the therapeutic space was barely internalized at this point gives insight into why I didn't think it was a good idea for them to stop coming.

Gabe, like Zoe, was impenetrable and remained that way upon termination, which he very calculatedly instigated. Using the DRFQ allowed for an appropriate focus on their attachment styles and projective gridlock. Gabe's very high DRF accuracy scores and manifest avoidant attachment style demonstrate the complexity of couple attachment systems and how couple attachment styles are inextricably bound with projective identification and shared defences.

Dan & Judy

Dan, 29, was an architect from the UK. He was bright and sensitive and seemed open to being in therapy. He had been in individual therapy for a number of years. He was quiet and reserved, but able to express himself when he needed to. He described himself as antisocial, preferring to spend time with a small group of intimate friends.

Judy, 29, worked in an NGO. She was also very bright and intuitive. She was much more outgoing and open and talkative. She did however have a good capacity to listen. She described herself as being very social. She loved to go dancing and to meet new people.

Treatment setting and duration

Dan and Judy attended once weekly therapy at the Tavistock Centre in North London. They attended joint couple sessions for 4 ½ months, approximately 20 sessions.

Performance on the DRFQ

Dan and Judy completed the DRFQ in their last week of therapy. They both had very high DRF accuracy and projection scores. They were asked to participate in the study because they seemed to be a much more securely attached couple. I wanted to see whether their performance would differ markedly from the other couples.

See tables 6.3.9 and 6.3.10 for details on Dan and Judy's DRF accuracy and projection scores, respectively, as well as means and standard deviations for the DRF accuracy and projection scores from the larger sample discussed in chapter (n = 96 couples):

Table 6.3.9: DRF accuracy scores for Dan and Judy and the respective means and standard deviations derived from the participants in the main study discussed in chapter 4 (n = 96 couples)

	DRF 1	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 2	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 3	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 4	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 5	Mean (S.D.)
Dan	1.05*	.44 (.29)	.62**	.40 (.37)	1.63*	.46 (.31)	.54**	.42 (.37)	.58*	.31 (.36)
Judy	.80*	.39 (.36)	1.11*	.53 (.33)	.63**	.39 (.39)	.42**	.38 (.41)	.28**	.32 (.32)

*** 1st quartile ** 2nd quartile ***3rd quartile ****4th quartile**

Table 6.3.10: DRF projection scores for Dan and Judy and the respective means and standard deviations derived from the participants in the main study discussed in chapter 4 (n = 96 couples)

	DRF 1 Projection	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 2 Projection	Mean (S.D.)	DRF 3 Projection	Mean (S.D.)
Dan	1.14*	.49 (.39)	1.57*	.69 (.41)	.54**	.34 (.34)
Judy	1.73*	.50 (.43)	1.68*	.78 (.41)	1.43*	.30 (.41)

*** 1st quartile ** 2nd quartile ***3rd quartile ****4th quartile**

Presenting problem

Dan and Judy presented for therapy because they were struggling with their differences following the "honeymoon" period of their marriage. They were attracted to each other's differences and felt that they were opposites in many respects, though they both felt that they shared a common philosophy of life in terms of what were the most fundamental things for both of them. They spent almost all of their time together. They started having problems when they started to explore their respective interests and establish more independence, which they both seemed to believe was healthy, yet it was something that they were struggling with.

Therapeutic process and outcome

Dan and Judy presented at therapy feeling positive about their prospects, but simultaneously feeling pretty deflated. They were both quite open and psychologically minded, but they were bickering quite a bit at the start of the therapy. They were criticising each other's extremes, especially with respect to their social life.

Dan was content to spend almost all of his time either with Judy or by himself. Judy was a social animal and felt that she needed to do things with other people both

on her own and as a couple. They bickered about the friends that Judy had, none of whom ever pasted Dan's exam. He didn't want to go out with business people, religious people, or conservatives. He had a very rigid idea about the type of person he wanted to be friends with and if they were outside one of those boundaries, they were moved to the recycling bin.

Dan was aware that he was a difficult person to be with. We explored their fit, which reflected the fit of *complementarity* that Clulow and Mattinson (1989) refer to with respect to couples who are attracted to each other because each person contains things that the other lacks and wants. It was easy for them to fall into the trap of taking extreme roles in the relationship and attacking in each other what they were originally, largely unconsciously attracted to.

After the first few sessions, the bickering started to settle down more and we spent the remainder of the sessions exploring their unconscious fit, how each looked for things in the other to complete themselves and how easy it was to feel threatened by these differences. Dan and Judy's abilities to listen and to take things on board reflect their high DRF accuracy scores, but their DRF projection scores were even more striking with respect to the other couples that participated in the study. The high projection scores could have reflected the sense that even though they were very different in many ways, they both felt that they were on the same page, very much a unit where it was safe to explore their differences and to try to compromise.

6.4 Conclusions

It is clear from applying the DRFQ to couples in therapy and working with the respective couples with a focus on dyadic reflective function that are a number of ways that the DRFQ can be clinically useful: 1) The DRFQ can be useful in identifying and concretizing specific issues for the couple. Couples often present for therapy with a very hazy and confused sense of their own situation. This was the case for Sam and Mindy, who knew there was something wrong, but they just couldn't identify what it was. Using the DRFQ with Sam and Mindy helped to focus the therapy and it helped them to identify more clearly what their problem area was. 2) Both Rob and Lara and Gabe and Talia manifested an extreme attachment relationship, where one appeared clearly to be the anxious one and the other the avoidant one. This was not really the case for either couple. Using the DRFQ helped to elucidate this asymmetry in order to work on the couple fit, withdrawing projections and taking ownership of feelings that felt too threatening to own in the first place. 3) It would have been really beneficial to have applied the DRFQ at different points in time in the therapy in order to assess the process of the therapy, if and how the dyadic reflective function was changing and how it differed at the outcome of therapy. 4) Empathy, or the lack thereof, is a problem in the vast majority of couples that present for therapy. One or both members of the couple inevitably feel misunderstood. There is often a sense of stagnation as a result of a prolonged feeling of disappointment, which serves to further embroil the couple in a projective gridlock where neither member of the couple feels heard or understood. The DRFQ was very useful in terms of focusing the couples on this ubiquitous issue, helping to flesh out the problem in a very concrete way by using a pronounced issue of disagreement. Couples are often unaware of the fact that they are not able to hear each other.

Individuals are usually so focused on not feeling heard themselves that they are not even thinking about hearing their partners. 5) The DRFQ also helps the patients themselves get a more tangible feel for the therapeutic process. They can own the problem and understand the focus of the intervention because they played a much more active role in the process. 6) If a couple is really stuck, the DRFQ can be a useful way to get them working on something together, thinking about their problems in a different way, using their imaginations and being more creative. These are all very challenging things, especially for a couple that feels numb, stuck, scared and confused. Sometimes something very specific and concrete can help the couple to feel contained and provide a structure that allows them to break free from this sense of inertia. 7) Couples were selected that presented with relatively marked anxious-avoidant attachment systems, except for Dan and Judy. The respective DRF accuracy scores were useful in exploring the respective attachments and how the lack of a secure base was related to dyadic reflective function and communication in the couple relationship.

It seems that the DRF accuracy scores were most useful as indicators of attachment style: high scores being associated with more anxiously attached individuals and low scores being associated with more avoidant individuals. It also appears that DRF projection scores were most useful as indicators of relationship satisfaction. Individuals with lower DRF projection scores were clearly those who seemed less satisfied in the relationship.

The complexity of the couple attachment system was fleshed out through the use of the DRFQ in a way that was incredibly useful for the therapist. DRF scores provided a meaningful and stimulating base for exploration.

Limitations of the study

One of the main drawbacks of this study was that it was not longitudinal. It would have been interesting to have given the DRFQ to couples at the beginning and at the end of therapy, as well as at some point in between. This would have obviously provided much more insight into whether the DRFQ was an accurate/insightful measure of change in the therapy.

Another drawback was the small sample size. The focus in the current study was on attachment style and performance on the DRFQ. It would be useful to do more qualitative analysis on a larger, more heterogeneous sample of couples.

In the following chapter, the future of DRF research will be explored including ideas for future studies and uses of the DRFQ following a more in depth theoretical exploration of some of the key issues that are related to, and inextricably bound with the concept of dyadic reflective function.

CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSIONS, CONNECTIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

7.1 Introduction

The couple dynamic is one that is wholly distinct from that of the individual. This has been stressed throughout the present work and has been demonstrated through some of the findings, especially the findings regarding attachment style and DRF accuracy. In the body of research discussed in chapter one, pioneered by Fonagy and his colleagues on reflective function and attachment, reflective function in the caregiver was found to be the most powerful predictor of attachment security in their children. Attachment security between child and caregiver has been posited to be fundamental in the development of reflective function in the child. Attachment security allows the child to explore his/her own internal world, to make connections, while simultaneously feeling safe enough to explore his/her external world.

In the couple relationship, it appears that anxious attachment can be related to higher dyadic reflective function and/or more empathic accuracy. A natural explanation for this is that it benefits the anxious individual to know what his/her partner is thinking and feeling. Findings in the present study and in the empathic accuracy literature have demonstrated that the relationship between attachment style anxiety and higher DRF scores and empathic accuracy, respectively, is true for women, but not for men.

The multi-faceted nature of attachment in couples has been discussed with regards to gender difference and the way that the unconscious couple fit allows for individuals to own or disown certain feelings or characteristics, which then become manifest in the partner. At first glance, it seems that the partner is the anxious one, but it is never that simple. An important task of couple therapy is the unpacking of

these unconscious projective mechanisms so that individuals can understand, acknowledge and own these feelings and in turn withdraw the projections.

What should be very clear by now is that the couple is an animal in and of itself. It is not possible to treat the couple relationship as comprising two distinct individuals. Once a couple is formed, there is a predominantly unconscious re-distribution of roles, behaviours, anxieties, goals, etc. In what follows, the nature of the internal world of the couple will be explored further, with a more in-depth examination of some critical theoretical concepts in couple work such as the marital container, projection and the Oedipus complex. These are concepts that are inextricably bound with dyadic reflective function. An elucidation of these critical concepts helps to more profoundly understand the nature and importance that dyadic reflective function can and should hold in the therapeutic relationship with couples. This is followed by a brief concluding section exploring future directions for the DRFQ and the concept of dyadic reflective function.

7.2 Further exploration of the couple relationship

7.2.1 *The marital container and couple therapy*

When two individuals commit to each other, an entity is created between them that is distinct from the characters of the individuals themselves. It is this entity that is worked with in marital therapy, as opposed to working with the internal world of the individuals (Colman, 1993). The internal world of the individuals is not ignored in marital therapy; rather it is examined through different lenses. The marriage is the holder of what is acceptable or not acceptable regarding projections and the transference within the couple. The individuals that comprise the couple are consistently, on different levels of consciousness, or non-consciousness, dictating the

terms of what is acceptable or not acceptable in the marriage. It is this that holds the focus of the therapist in marital therapy. It is the unspoken container that the couple has created, and "the marital therapist's focus is on the interaction between the couple as *an end in itself*" (73).

Another important and universal aspect of the marital relationship embodies the constant struggle, or tension between being an autonomous, independent individual while simultaneously being a member of a couple; a part of a whole. This touches on a theme that is central to attachment theory, the fact that different individuals have different comfort levels, thoughts and behaviours regarding attachment to others. Much of what contributes to an individual's working model of attachment (Bowlby, 1979) derives from his/her history with primary caregivers and subsequent attachment relationships.

While the goal of individual therapy is to help the patient to contain his/her psychic contents within an "integrated self" and to achieve individuation, the marital container must "be able to contain the tension that arises from the need of the individuals to develop outside the relationship as well as within it. For to be totally contained within a relationship would require the abolition of separateness and individual autonomy – the very opposite of individuation" (Colman, 1993, p. 74).

Fonagy and Target (1997) refer to the importance of feeling secure enough to make attributions of mental states with regards to the behaviour of the caregiver. It is interesting to think that the insecurity that would prevent or inhibit making these attributions regarding one's relationship to one's parents, would simultaneously be an impetus for understanding in the couple relationship. It is worth reiterating the previously stated theory that Fonagy and Target (1997) conceive of reflective function as a skill that is not "simply a property of the person, but of the person and situation

together, because all skills are composed of both the person's activities and the contexts within which these occur" (694). There are an infinite number of variables that contribute to the development of this skill, including relationships, emotions and one's environment. Reflective function should be understood as representing a piece of the developmental puzzle that is connected to other pieces of the puzzle, but not wholly dependent upon them. Circumstances, events, emotional triggers, etc. will consciously or unconsciously impact the ability to mentalize in a given situation with a given person. This "unevenness" across situations and relationships is expected to exist in adulthood just as it does in childhood.

The fact that anxiously attached individuals tend to have higher dyadic reflective function and empathic accuracy scores begs the question, what does it really mean to have more developed dyadic reflective function? There are definitely circumstances and relationships where these false positives exist. This has been discussed in previous chapters. But why should it be called a false positive if a highly anxious partner has high DRF in a situation of disagreement? The answer is that it is a defence. The knowledge is more than likely being used as a means of control rather than as a means of understanding and appreciating the partner's feelings. It is important to try to make this distinction. Using the DRFQ alongside an attachment measure allows for a meaningful exploration of this complex relationship. This is demonstrated in the qualitative analysis discussed in chapter six.

Dyadic reflective function is a concept that is rooted in development and in the primary attachment relationship. This does not mean that a child that is securely attached will necessarily be securely attached in his/her couple relationship(s). But it is the foundation for future relationships and it is important to try to explore people's situations in a more holistic context versus identifying a specific problem in isolation,

measuring it and making some sort of claim regarding someone's personality. This was one of the primary motivators behind the development of the DRFQ. The core concepts that represent the foundation of dyadic reflective function include caregiver attachment security and reflective function and the Oedipus complex. It is crucial to attempt to integrate an understanding of earlier relationships and all that this implies with couple relationships. This will be elaborated on further in the following sub-sections.

7.2.2 The" third space" in the couple relationship

The ability to think about oneself in meta-cognitive terms is a defining characteristic of adult attachment (Holmes, 2001). Reflective function involves the creation, or unconscious acceptance of a third position in the relationship, one that is more overtly occupied by the therapist when the couple is in marital therapy. "When representations can be made explicit in language, they are then available for 'thinking about thinking', and so for modification. This is the cognitive aspect of the neo-Kleinian conceptualisation of the oedipal situation..." (xx).

To be able to work in a triad, there must be space for each individual to accept him/herself as a member of the couple and simultaneously as excluded from the couple, as an observer. This shared space is a "reflective space" that comes with dealing with, or resolving oedipal issues. It entails being able to live with the ambivalence of simultaneously loving and hating a loved one, and having feelings of rage and envy that can be contained. Fisher (1993) stated that it is the experience of what Klein came to call the 'depressive position' – that is, the capacity for acknowledging the hated and the loved object as one and the same.

An alternative approach to thinking about the Oedipal triangle refers back to Bion and Winnicott's notions of containment and the "good-enough mother"

respectively, and Winnicott's idea of the "false self". If the mother is able to accept, digest and project back the infant's projections in a more digestible form, this leads to the infant feeling contained by the mother. But what if the mother cannot contain her infant? If the infant has no one to accept and transform his projections, he will be forced to maintain a split between the good and the bad, making the depressive position much more difficult to attain, as well as the creative third space alluded to earlier.

In terms of the parental relationship, understanding and accepting the ambivalence that is felt via the frustration of the impenetrability of the parent's relationship allows for the formation of this third space. "The recognition of the parental relationship creates a boundary for the internal world making possible...a 'triangular space'. This provides a grounding for the 'separation/individuation process in the oedipal relationship" (Fisher, 1993, p. 158). This creation and acceptance of the parental relationship is thought by Fisher to be the link that is "being re-created repeatedly in unconscious phantasy that is the unconscious basis of all creative couplings" (159). The importance of the role of Oedipal dynamics in couple relationships is echoed by Britton, who suggests that the Oedipal triangular relationship provides the basis for the development of the capacity to be an individual in an intimate relationship (Fisher & Crandell, 2001).

Britton emphasizes the importance of accepting and coming to terms with feelings of ambivalence in love relationships as being crucial to the oedipal process. Being able to tolerate feelings of love and hate facilitates the creation of a third space from which object relations can be observed. This in turn allows for the possibility of being observed, which provides us with a capacity for seeing ourselves in interaction with others and for entertaining another point of view whilst retaining our own, for

reflecting on ourselves whilst being ourselves (Britton, 1989).

The next big question is how is oedipal conflict reflected in working with couples? There are a number of ways that it becomes evident. One is when a couple is only a couple because the two individuals are physically together. They are unable to relate to each other or to hear what the other has to say. It is clear that there is no reflective space for the couple. Fisher calls it a "duet for one", a "false couple made up of the tyrannical self and the compliant object, or, conversely, the compliant self and the tyrannical object, unable together to create the triangular space necessary for genuine mutual relating" (Fisher, 1993, p. 163).

This is not the only way that Oedipal conflict can appear in working with couples. Another way to avoid the third space is for the couple to be as one, not allowing for any difference between them. Fisher (1993) calls this the illusion of the *fixed couple*. Fisher elucidates the difficulty that the "impenetrable other" type of couple places on the therapist in terms of working with the couple as a unit and understanding what is going on between them, versus colluding with the massive defensive network in "enacting rather than understanding in the therapy session" (165).

Fisher & Crandell (2001), posit that the development of the capacity to accept the third position in the couple relationship, which implies the ability to reflect on oneself and one's partner, "could be a marker of a desired outcome in psychotherapy with couples: that is, an increased capacity to do this for each partner *vis-à-vis* the other" (Fisher & Crandell, 2001, p. 15).

7.2.3 Projection, projective identification and the couple relationship

Projective identification, like containment, is a concept with many faces that has been used by different theorists in many contexts. Bion's notion of projective

identification is a highly interpersonal, inter-subjective process. It is associated with developmental processes and healthy functioning, and it is not considered to exist solely in a defensive context.

Melanie Klein is one of the founding mothers of the concept. She developed the concept with reference to "a mechanism revealed in phantasies in which the subject inserts his self – in whole or in part – into the object in order to harm, possess or control it" (Laplanche & Pontalis, 1988). Klein discussed projection with reference to babies projecting their anger and envy of being deprived of the breast, into the mother. At the point of deprivation, the breast is felt as being the "bad" object, separate and distinct from the life-giving object that provides milk to the baby. Integration has not yet been consolidated, and this projection of rage into the "bad breast" is the act of an infant in the "paranoid-schizoid position", void of guilt that destroying the bad breast is simultaneously destroying the good breast.

When the infant is capable of realizing that the bad breast and the good breast are one and the same, he feels guilty for doing damage to the breast that sustains him, and he begins to manage his ambivalence. The ability to integrate good and bad marks a move into Klein's "depressive position".

Projection is often used as a defence. One can project unwanted or threatening feelings onto others because it is too painful or dangerous to experience the feelings oneself. Couples consistently project their desires, phantasies and fears onto each other and onto the marriage, or, more specifically, onto the marital container. Often, couples appear in therapy when they are not able to contain their own projections. The projections inevitably become directed to the therapist, and the therapist, much like "Bion's mother", if he is able to withstand the projections: "He gives back to the patient, via his interpretations, those psychic elements he has been able to process,

thus promoting the patient's capacity to think about and to reflect upon his own experience" (Colman, 1993, p. 76).

Much of what acts as containment in the marital therapeutic process derives from the boundaries that are constructed in the analytic situation, within which the analysis takes place. A lot of what is considered to constitute containment in this respect is the structure of the relationship itself, a transference-based relationship that allows for the couple to feel contained due to the fact that the therapist, as a receptacle of their projections, can manage them and feed them back to the couple in a modified form. This notion of the therapist "holding" the couple echoes Winnicott's concept of "holding", which places the therapist in a similar role of containing the client.

Milton Erickson postulated that four types of love exist, and in good marriages they exist simultaneously: "I love me; I love me in you; I love your good qualities; and I enjoy the fact that you are happy" (Clulow & Mattinson, 1989). In many marriages, especially in troubled marriages that present for marital therapy, there are voids or wounds that demonstrate an imbalance in these categories. The "I love me in you" category is a narcissistic category, where heavy projection tends to exist because, "I feel good with you who either shares my feelings, expresses them for me or helps me to defend myself against them" (52). This process occurs to an extent in almost all marriages. It is when there is an extreme sense of rigidity in one position that things can become problematic. Clulow and Mattinson identify three processes that reflect the "Me in you" type of love.

The first process is that of "Identification". This refers to the type of person who is unable to deal with the "otherness" of others; whose relationships, both romantic and otherwise, reflect a conscious or unconscious necessity to seek those who are similar. In terms of marriage, this identification process inevitably leads to

trouble when differences arise. "Emergence of difference is often experienced as a shock to the whole system, a sudden puncturing of the illusion of sameness" (Clulow & Mattinson, 1989, p. 53).

The second process in the "Me in you" type is that of "Complementarity". Complementarity, like identification, exists to a certain extent in most marriages. It embodies loving in one's partner what one feels that he/she does not have oneself. One might say that it constitutes a need for wholeness where, one partner may choose and use the other to express a feared or unrecognized part of the self; the unrecognized me in you (Clulow & Mattinson, 1989). At first glance, complementarity appears to be the opposite of identification, but when you conceptualize it in terms of loving the unrecognized me in you, there exists a similar strand of narcissistic longing.

The "Defences" are the third "Me in you" process. Clulow and Mattinson claim that a "psychological defence" against pain or anxiety can take any form, and it is not restricted to the classic list of defences such as repression, denial, displacement, splitting, projection and reaction formation. Anger can be a defence against depression, just as depression can serve as a defence against anger. The defences, just as the previous two processes, are necessary for survival. It is only when they become over used or rigid that problems arise. Clulow & Mattinson (1989) claim that the difference between mental health and mental ill-health is based in the flexibility in which the defences are employed.

Projection is a defence that is used frequently in the "I love me in you" type of love. The over-use of projection can exacerbate the problem that it was originally meant to defend against. An unconsciously avoidant person might seek an avoidant partner, thereby creating a "double-dose" of the avoidance in his internal world. Just

as someone who unconsciously seeks a mirroring partner can use projection, it can equally be utilized to emphasize the differences in one's partner.

Even though many people marry to consciously break free from their past, the unconscious is often much more resistant to such change. Pincus, in *The Nature of Marital Interaction*, succinctly encapsulates this unconscious need to repeat, where the unconscious bond with the first love-object plays a large part in one's attraction to partners later in life where feelings and situations from the first love-object can be compulsively re-enacted (Pincus, 1960). Pincus asserts that it is the unconscious that persists in causing problems in the marriage, despite the fact that the couple might consciously want to change.

The unconscious needs of one partner will often be revealed in projected form in the other partner, which can present itself as a messy tangled web of distorted boundaries. The job of the therapist lies in keeping the unconscious fit in mind, helping each partner to recognize the denied or rejected aspects of himself which they have found in or projected on to their partner (Pincus, 1960).

There is so much that has been written on these topics, way too much to address and reflect on in this thesis. But it would be neglectful not to at least introduce some of these concepts that are part and parcel of the concept of dyadic reflective function. It should be clear that exploring developmental and attachment theory in the context of the couple relationship provides for an incredibly rich, multi-layered and multi-faceted base for exploration. The DRFQ represents yet another birth from this very comprehensive mother. In the following section, some ideas are presented as to how this child will hopefully continue to grow and develop even further.

7.3 Future directions

The more this study advanced, it seemed to take on a life of its own. Every new finding gave birth to new hypotheses and new ideas while simultaneously shedding doubt on other ones. There were countless times throughout the process when I wished that I would have been able to start over with the knowledge that I gained. It's the old adage: "If I knew then what I know now". It was only when I was able to frame this work as one big learning experience, one that will hopefully never end, that I was able to understand and accept that the whole point of undergoing such an enormous expedition is not to arrive at a point where one suddenly *knows* what one set out to know. The truth, whatever that may be, is in the voyage itself. That being said, there is definitely much more new territory to explore and so much more to learn. The following are some ideas for exploration, which would build upon this work.

It was intended that the sample in the main study was going to consist of 50% of couples in therapy and 50% from the general population. An important validity study would be to see whether performance on the DRFQ could reveal meaningful differences between clinical and non-clinical populations.

Another useful validity study would entail adapting Fonagy's RF Scale to a couple attachment interview to examine the relationship between performance on the DRFQ and on the coded interview.

It is important, based on the developmental roots of reflective functioning, to examine the relationship between reflective functioning as assessed via the RF Scale thinking about the primary caregiver, and dyadic reflective functioning in the couple relationship. It has already been made clear that reflective functioning cannot be generalized across relationships and situations, but it would be interesting to examine

the relationship between caregiver and couple and, if the couple have children, to explore the relationship between children's theory of mind and parent's dyadic reflective functioning.

There were a lot of encouraging findings that set the stage for this work to be the foundation for a work in progress rather than a finite exploration. Test-retest reliability of the DRFQ was quite stable over a one-year period. DRF scores were not found to be confounded with variables such as psychological mindedness and/or personality style. Many findings corroborated similar findings in the empathic accuracy literature regarding attachment style, relationship satisfaction and gender differences. In the qualitative study discussed in the previous chapter, performance on the DRFQ seemed to encapsulate the respective couples' dynamics, especially regarding their respective attachments, and the DRFQ proved to be an extremely useful tool from a clinical standpoint.

Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI)	Snyder & Smith	1986	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMSS)	P. Burnett	1987	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
Quality Marriage Index	F. D. Fincham & T. N. Bradbury	1987	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS)	Hendrick	1988	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
Relationship Satisfaction Questionnaire	D. D. Burns and S. L. Sayers	1992	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
ENRICH (evaluation and nurturing relationship issues, communication, and happiness) Marital Satisfaction (EMS) Scale	Fowers,-Blaine-J; Olson,-David-H	1994	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
Global Assessment of Relational Functioning (GARF)	Wilkins & White	2001	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
RELATE model	Busby, Holman & Taniguchi	2001	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
The Minding Scale	Omarzu, Whalen, & Harvey	2001	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS)	?	?	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
Personal Assessment of Intimate Relationships inventory	M. T. Schaefer and D. H. Olson	?	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
Timberlawn Couple and Family Evaluation Scales (TCFES)	Housson	1996	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction /Behavioural Measures
Adult Attachment Interview (AAI)	Main, et al.	1996	Attachment
Peer Attachment Interview (PAI)	Bartholomew & Horowitz	1991	Attachment
Family Attachment Interview (FAI)	Bartholomew & Horowitz	1991	Attachment
Adult Attachment Questionnaire (AAQ)	Hazan & Shaver	1987	Attachment
Attachment Styles Inventory (ASI)	Sperling & Berman	1991	Attachment
Reciprocal Attachment Questionnaire (RAQ)	West, Sheldon, & Reiffer	1987	Attachment
Attachment Styles Questionnaire (ASQ)	Feeney, Noller, & Hanrahan	1994	Attachment
Adult Attachment Scale (AAS)	Simpson	1990	Attachment
Relationship Scales Questionnaire (RSQ)	Griffin & Bartholomew	1994a, 1994b	Attachment
Revised Adult Attachment Scale (RAAS)	Collins & Read	1990	Attachment
Relationship Questionnaire (RQ)	Bartholomew & Horowitz	1991	Attachment
Current Relationship Interview (CRI)	Owens et al.	?	Attachment
Attachment Screening Questionnaire	Cowens	?	Attachment
Couples Interaction Scoring System	Gottman	1979	Behavioural Measure
Dyadic Trust Scale	R. E. Larzelere and T. L. Huston	1981	Behavioural Measure
Communication style Q-set (CSQS)	Stephen,-Timothy-D; Harrison, Teresa-M	1986	Behavioural Measure
	Wampler,-Karen-S; Halverson,		

Couple Communication	Cowens	1985	Conflict & Distress
Withdrawal & Avoidance in Marriage Scale (WAM)	Daniels	1996	Conflict & Distress
Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	Strauss et al.	1996	Conflict & Distress
Interpersonal Relationship Resolution Scale (IRRS)	Hargrave & Sells	1997	Conflict & Distress
Spousal Inventory of Desired Changes and Relationship Barriers (SIDCARB)	?	?	Conflict & Distress
Compatibility Index (CI)	Moody	1983	Personality Dimensions, Attitudes & Beliefs
SFIS-R	Perosa & Perosa	1990	Personality Dimensions, Attitudes & Beliefs
Couple and Family Therapy Alliance Scales	Heatherington,-Laurie; Friedlander,-Myrna-L	1992	Personality Dimensions, Attitudes & Beliefs
Commitment to Partnership Scale (CPS)	Galea	1996	Personality Dimensions, Attitudes & Beliefs
Adult BERI	Bartle-Haring, Leite, Brucker, Griffin, Miller, & Yang	1997	Personality Dimensions, Attitudes & Beliefs
Relationship Belief Scale (RBS)	Sullivan	1997	Personality Dimensions, Attitudes & Beliefs
Relational Privacy Preferences Scale (RPPS)	Craddock	1997	Personality Dimensions, Attitudes & Beliefs
NEO-Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO-PI-R)	?	?	Personality Dimensions, Attitudes & Beliefs
General Attitude and Belief Scale	?	?	Personality Dimensions, Attitudes & Beliefs
Love Scale	Rubin	1970	Sex, Gender, Love & Intimacy
Passionate Love Scale (PLS)	Hatfield,-Elaine; Sprecher,-Susan	1986	Sex, Gender, Love & Intimacy
Love Attitudes Scale	Hendrick & Hendrick	1986	Sex, Gender, Love & Intimacy
Relationship Closeness Inventory	Berscheid et al.	1989	Sex, Gender, Love & Intimacy
Marital Intimacy Questionnaire (MIQ)	Van-den-Broucke,-Stephan; Vertommen,-Hans; Vandereycken,-Walter	1995	Sex, Gender, Love & Intimacy
Need Fulfillment Inventory (NFI)	?	?	Sex, Gender, Love & Intimacy
Center for Marital and Sexual Health Sexual Function Questionnaire (CMSH-SFQ)	?	?	Sex, Gender, Love & Intimacy
Bem Sex-Role Inventory	?	?	Sex, Gender, Love & Intimacy
Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test	Locke & Wallace	1959	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS)	Spanier	1976	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction
Marital Satisfaction Scale	Roach,-Arthur-J; Frazier,-Larry-P; Bowden,-Sharon-R	1982	Adjustment, Functioning & Satisfaction

Appendix 2.1: Couple measure review

Appendix 2.2: Feedback form

Feedback

1. How did you feel taking the questionnaire?

2. What do you think I was looking for?

3. What parts did you find easy?

4. What parts did you find difficult?

5. How long did it take to complete?

6. How clear were the instructions?

7. Additional comments:

Appendix 2.3a: ECR-R

The Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) Questionnaire
Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000)

Rate each item on the 7-point scale given below from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
1. I'm afraid that I will lose my partner's love.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I often wish that my partner's feelings were as strong as my feelings for him or her	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I worry a lot about my relationships.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I rarely worry about my partner leaving me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I do not often worry about being abandoned.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
17. I worry that I won't measure up to other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. It's not difficult for me to get close to my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. I tell my partner just about everything.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I talk things over with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. I find it easy to depend on romantic partners.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. It's easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. My partner really understands me and my needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Abbreviated Dyadic Adjustment Scale **Appendix 2.3b: ADAS**

Most people have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each of the following three items. Please circle the number which best fits your answer.

	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Agree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
1. Philosophy of life	5	4	3	2	1	0
2. Aims, goals and things believed to be important.	5	4	3	2	1	0
3. Amount of time spent Together.	5	4	3	2	1	0

How often would you say the following events occur between you and your partner?

	Never	Less than once a month	Once or twice a month	Once or twice a week	Once a day	More often
4. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas.	5	4	3	2	1	0
5. Calmly discuss something.	5	4	3	2	1	0
6. Work together on a project	5	4	3	2	1	0

The dots on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy", represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the dot which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Extremely Unhappy	**Fairly Unhappy**	**A Little Unhappy**	**Happy**	**Very Happy**	**Extremely Happy**	**Perfect**

The Psychological Mindedness Scale

Appendix 2.3c: PMS

Forty-five statements are listed below. Each statement is followed by four phrases:

Strongly agree
Mostly agree
Mostly disagree
Strongly disagree

Please place a check next to the phrase which best describes how you feel about each.

	Strongly Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I would be willing to talk about my personal problems if I thought it might help me or a member of my family.	___	___	___	___
2. I am always curious about the reasons people behave as they do.	___	___	___	___
3. I think that most people who are mentally ill have something physically wrong with their brain.	___	___	___	___
4. When I have a problem, if I talk about it with a friend, I feel a lot better.	___	___	___	___
5. Often I don't know what I'm feeling.	___	___	___	___
6. I am willing to change old habits to try a new way of doing things.	___	___	___	___
7. There are certain problems which I could not discuss outside my immediate family.	___	___	___	___
8. I often find myself thinking about what made me act in a certain way.	___	___	___	___
9. Emotional problems can sometimes make you physically sick.	___	___	___	___
10. When you have problems, talking about them with other people just makes them worse.	___	___	___	___
11. Usually, if I feel an emotion, I can identify it.	___	___	___	___
12. If a friend gave me advice about how to do something better, I'd try it out.	___	___	___	___
13. I am annoyed by someone, whether he is a doctor or not, who wants to know about my personal problems.	___	___	___	___
14. I find that once I develop a habit, it is hard to change, even if I know there is another way of doing things that might be better.	___	___	___	___

	Strongly Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. I think that people who are mentally ill often have problems which began in their childhood.	____	____	____	____
16. Letting off steam by talking to someone about your problems often makes you feel a lot better.	____	____	____	____
17. People sometimes say that I act as if I'm having a certain emotion (anger, for example) when I am unaware of it.	____	____	____	____
18. I get annoyed when people give me advice about changing the way I do things.	____	____	____	____
19. It would not be difficult for me to talk about personal problems with people such as doctors and clergymen.	____	____	____	____
20. If a good friend of mine suddenly started to insult me, my first reaction might be to try to understand why he was so angry.	____	____	____	____
21. I think that when a person has crazy thoughts, it is often because he is very anxious and upset.	____	____	____	____
22. I've never found that talking to other people about my worries helps much.	____	____	____	____
23. Often, even though I know that I'm having an emotion, I don't know what it is.	____	____	____	____
24. I like to do things the way I've done them in the past. I don't like to try to change my behaviour much.	____	____	____	____
25. There are some things in my life that I would not discuss with anyone.	____	____	____	____
26. Understanding the reasons you have deep down for acting in certain ways is important.	____	____	____	____
27. At work, if someone suggested a different way of doing a job that might be better, I'd give it a try.	____	____	____	____
28. I've found that when I talk about my problems to someone else, I come up with ways to solve them that I hadn't thought of before.	____	____	____	____
29. I am sensitive to the changes in my own feelings.	____	____	____	____

	Strongly Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
30. When I learn a new way of doing something, I like to try it out to see if it would work better than what I had been doing before.	___	___	___	___
31. It is important to be open and honest when you talk about your troubles with someone you trust.	___	___	___	___
32. I really enjoy trying to figure other people out.	___	___	___	___
33. I think that most people with mental problems have probably received some kind of injury to their head.	___	___	___	___
34. Talking about your worries to another person helps you to understand problems better.	___	___	___	___
35. I'm usually in touch with my feelings.	___	___	___	___
36. I like to try new things, even if it involves taking risks	___	___	___	___
37. It would be very difficult for me to discuss upsetting or embarrassing aspects of my personal life with people, even if I trust them.	___	___	___	___
38. If I suddenly lost my temper with someone, without knowing exactly why, my first impulse would be to forget about it.	___	___	___	___
39. I think that what a person's environment (family, etc.) is like has little to do with whether he develops mental problems.	___	___	___	___
40. When you have troubles, talking about them to someone else just makes you more confused.	___	___	___	___
41. I frequently don't want to delve too deeply into what I'm feeling.	___	___	___	___
42. I don't like doing things if there is a chance that they won't work out.	___	___	___	___
43. I think that no matter how hard you try, you'll never really understand what makes people tick.	___	___	___	___
44. I think that what goes on deep down in a person's mind is important in determining whether he will have a mental illness.	___	___	___	___
45. Fear of embarrassment or failure doesn't stop me from trying something new.	___	___	___	___

rsonal Problems – Circumplex

Appendix 2.3d: IIP-C

rate each statement using the following rating scale:

It is hard for me to...

	Not at all	A little Bit	Moderately	Quite a Bit	Extremely
trust other people.	0	1	2	3	4
say "no" to other people.	0	1	2	3	4
join in on groups.	0	1	2	3	4
keep things private from other people.	0	1	2	3	4
let other people know what I want.	0	1	2	3	4
tell a person to stop bothering me.	0	1	2	3	4
introduce myself to new people.	0	1	2	3	4
confront people with problems that come up.	0	1	2	3	4
be assertive with another person.	0	1	2	3	4
. let other people know when I'm angry.	0	1	2	3	4
. make a long-term commitment to another person.	0	1	2	3	4
. be another person's boss.	0	1	2	3	4
. be aggressive toward someone when the situation calls for it.	0	1	2	3	4
. socialize with other people.	0	1	2	3	4
. show affection to people.	0	1	2	3	4
. get along with people.	0	1	2	3	4
. understand another person's point of view.	0	1	2	3	4
. express my feelings to other people directly.	0	1	2	3	4
. be firm when I need to be.	0	1	2	3	4
. experience a feeling of love for another person.	0	1	2	3	4
. set limits on other people.	0	1	2	3	4
. be supportive of another person's goals in life.	0	1	2	3	4
. feel close to other people	0	1	2	3	4
. really care about other people's problems.	0	1	2	3	4
. argue with another person.	0	1	2	3	4
. spend time alone.	0	1	2	3	4
. give a gift to another person.	0	1	2	3	4
. let myself feel angry at somebody I like.	0	1	2	3	4
. put somebody else's needs before my own.	0	1	2	3	4
. stay out of other people's business.	0	1	2	3	4
. take instructions from people who have authority over me.	0	1	2	3	4

	Not at all	A Little Bit	Moderately	Quite a Bit	Extremely
. feel good about another person's happiness.	0	1	2	3	4
. ask other people to get together socially with me.	0	1	2	3	4
. feel angry at other people.	0	1	2	3	4
. open up and tell my feelings to another person.	0	1	2	3	4
. forgive another person after I've been angry.	0	1	2	3	4
. attend to my own welfare when somebody else is needy.	0	1	2	3	4
. be assertive without worrying about hurting other's feelings.	0	1	2	3	4
. be self-confident when I am with other people	0	1	2	3	4

t II. The following are things that I do too much.

	Not at all	A Little Bit	Moderately	Quite a Bit	Extremely
I fight with other people too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I feel too responsible for solving other people's problems.	0	1	2	3	4
I am too easily persuaded by other people.	0	1	2	3	4
I open up to people too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I am too independent.	0	1	2	3	4
I am too aggressive toward other people.	0	1	2	3	4
I try to please other people too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I clown around too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I want to be noticed too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I trust other people too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I try to control other people too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I put other people's needs before my own too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I try to change other people too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I am too gullible.	0	1	2	3	4
I am overly generous to other people.	0	1	2	3	4
I am too afraid of other people.	0	1	2	3	4
I am too suspicious of other people.	0	1	2	3	4
I manipulate other people too much to get what I want.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell personal things to other people too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I argue with other people too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I keep other people at a distance too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I let other people take advantage of me too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I feel embarrassed in front of other people too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I am affected by another person's misery too much.	0	1	2	3	4
I want to get revenge against people too much.	0	1	2	3	4

Questions considering yourself IN GENERAL* **Appendix 2.3e: EPQ-R S**

Please answer each question by putting a circle around the 'YES' or 'NO' following the question. There are no right or wrong answers, and no trick questions. Work quickly and do not think too long about the exact meaning of the questions.

PLEASE REMEMBER TO ANSWER EACH QUESTION

1. Does your mood often go up and down?	YES	NO
2. Do you take too much notice of what people think	YES	NO
3. Are you a talkative person	YES	NO
4. If you say you will do something. Do you always keep your promise no matter how inconvenient it might be?	YES	NO
5. Do you ever feel 'just miserable' for no reason?	YES	NO
6. Would being in debt worry you?	YES	NO
7. Are you rather lively?	YES	NO
8. Were you ever greedy by helping yourself to more than your fair share of anything?	YES	NO
9. Are you an irritable person?	YES	NO
10. Would you take drugs which may have a strange effect on you?	YES	NO
11. Do you enjoy meeting new people?	YES	NO
12. Have you ever blamed someone for doing something you knew was really your fault?	YES	NO
13. Are your feelings easily hurt?	YES	NO
14. Do you prefer to go your own way rather than act by the rules?	YES	NO
15. Can you usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself at a lively party?	YES	NO
16. Are *all* your habits good and desirable ones?	YES	NO
17. Do you often feel 'fed up'?	YES	NO
18. Do good manners and cleanliness matter to you?	YES	NO
19. Do you usually take the initiative in making good friends?	YES	NO
20. Have you ever taken anything (even a pin or a button) that belonged to someone else?	YES	NO
21. Would you call yourself a nervous person?	YES	NO
22. Do you think marriage is old-fashioned and should be done away with?	YES	NO
23. Can you easily get some life into a rather dull party?	YES	NO
24. Have you ever broken or lost something belonging to someone else?	YES	NO
25. Are you a worrier?	YES	NO
26. Do you enjoy co-operating with others?	YES	NO
27. Do you tend to keep in the background in social occasions?	YES	NO
28. Does it worry you if you know that there are mistakes in your work?	YES	NO
29. Have you ever said anything bad or nasty about anyone?	YES	NO

* Adapted from Eysenck 1991

30. Would you call yourself tense or 'highly strung'? YES NO
31. Do you think people spend too much time safeguarding their future with savings and insurance? YES NO
32. Do you like mixing with people? YES NO
33. As a child were you ever cheeky to your parents? YES NO
34. Do you worry too long after an embarrassing experience? YES NO
35. Do you try not to be rude to people? YES NO
36. Do you like plenty of bustle and excitement around you? YES NO
37. Have you ever cheated at a game? YES NO
38. Do you suffer from 'nerves'? YES NO
39. Would you like other people to be afraid of you? YES NO
40. Have you ever taken advantage of someone? YES NO
41. Are you mostly quiet when you are with other people? YES NO
42. Do you often feel lonely? YES NO
43. Is it better to follow society's rules than go your own way? YES NO
44. Do other people think of you as being very lively? YES NO
45. Do you always practice what you preach? YES NO
46. Are you often troubled about feelings of guilt? YES NO
47. Do you sometimes put off until tomorrow what you ought to do today? YES NO
48. Can you get a party going? YES NO

w is a list of problems and complaints that people sometimes have. Read each item carefully and select the number from the scale v that best describes HOW MUCH DISCOMFORT THAT PROBLEM HAS CAUSED YOU DURING THE PAST 4 WEEKS, LUDING TODAY. Place that number in the box to the right of each problem. Please do not skip any items.

Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
0	1	2	3	4

/ MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY:

1. Nervousness or shakiness inside ___
2. Faintness or dizziness ___
3. The idea that someone else can control your thoughts ___
4. Feeling others are to blame for most of your troubles ___
5. Trouble remembering things ___
6. Feeling easily annoyed or irritated ___
7. Pains in heart or chest ___
8. Feeling afraid in open spaces ___
9. Thoughts of ending your life ___
10. Feeling that most people cannot be trusted ___
11. Poor appetite ___
12. Suddenly scared for no reason ___
13. Temper outbursts that you could not control ___
14. Feeling lonely even when you are with people ___
15. Feeling blocked in getting things done ___
16. Feeling lonely ___
17. Feeling blue ___
18. Feeling no interest in things ___
19. Feeling fearful ___
20. Your feelings being easily hurt ___
21. Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you ___
22. Feeling inferior to others ___
23. Nausea or upset stomach ___
24. Feeling that you are watched or talked about by others ___
25. Trouble falling asleep ___
26. Having to check and doublecheck what you do ___
27. Difficulty making decisions ___
28. Nervousness or shakiness inside ___
29. Faintness or dizziness ___
30. The idea that someone else can control your thoughts ___
31. Feeling others are to blame for most of your troubles ___
32. Trouble remembering things ___
33. Feeling easily annoyed or irritated ___
34. Pains in heart or chest ___
35. Feeling afraid in open spaces ___
36. Thoughts of ending your life ___
37. Feeling that most people cannot be trusted ___
38. Poor appetite ___
39. Suddenly scared for no reason ___
40. Temper outbursts that you could not control ___
41. Feeling lonely even when you are with people ___
42. Feeling blocked in getting things done ___
43. Feeling lonely ___
44. Feeling blue ___
45. Feeling no interest in things ___
46. Feeling fearful ___
47. Your feelings being easily hurt ___
48. Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you ___
49. Feeling inferior to others ___
50. Nausea or upset stomach ___
51. Feeling that you are watched or talked about by others ___
52. Trouble falling asleep ___
53. Having to check and doublecheck what you do ___
54. Difficulty making decisions ___

Appendix 2.3f: BSI

Appendix 2.4: Demographics

Demographics

1. Name: _____

2. Age: _____

3. Sex (Circle one): M F

4. Ethnicity: _____

5. Religiousness: (Circle the number from 0 to 4):

0	1	2	3	4
Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely

6. Occupation: _____

7. Education completed (Circle one): Secondary University Graduate Post-Graduate

8. Marital status (Circle one): Dating Married Co-habiting, but not married

9. Have you been married previously? (Circle one): Yes No

10. If so, how many times? _____

11. How long have you been married? _____

12. How long have you been together? _____

13. Your parent's marital satisfaction (Circle the number from 0 to 6):

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Extremely unhappy	Fairly unhappy	A little unhappy	Happy	Very happy	Extremely happy	Perfect

14. Do you have children? (Circle one): Yes No

15. If so, how old are they? _____

16. Are your children from your current marriage/relationship? (Circle one): Yes No

17. Are you currently in therapy? (Circle one): Yes No

18. If so, for how long? _____

19. Type of therapy (Circle one): Individual Couple Family

20. Relative to your married/couple friends, how happy is your marriage/relationship? (Circle the number from 0 to 4):

0	1	2	3	4
Extremely unhappier	A lot unhappier	About the same	A lot happier	Extremely happier

21. Please rate what you believe would be your overall IQ (100 being average) (Circle the number from 0 to 4):

0	1	2	3	4
Below 85	85 – 100	100 – 115	115 – 130	Above 130

I. THE ISSUE

Appendix 2.5a: DRFQ male

Issue: _____

You and your partner jointly selected the issue concerning _____ as a major topic of disagreement between you. Following are some questions concerning this issue. Please answer the questions to the best of your ability.

II. YOU

A: Using the scale below, please circle the number next to <u>each</u> of the adjectives that best describes <u>YOU</u> during the disagreement:

E.g. Sad_(2)_ (This means that you felt moderately sad)

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1. Thoughtful	0	1	2	3	4
2. Annoyed	0	1	2	3	4
3. Bored	0	1	2	3	4
4. Sympathetic	0	1	2	3	4
5. Frustrated	0	1	2	3	4
6. Involved	0	1	2	3	4
7. Demanding	0	1	2	3	4
8. Apprehensive	0	1	2	3	4
9. Effective	0	1	2	3	4
10. Perplexed	0	1	2	3	4
11. Detached	0	1	2	3	4
12. Confident	0	1	2	3	4
13. Interested	0	1	2	3	4
14. Unsure	0	1	2	3	4
15. Optimistic	0	1	2	3	4
16. Distracted	0	1	2	3	4
17. Alert	0	1	2	3	4
18. Tired	0	1	2	3	4
19. Headachey or ill	0	1	2	3	4

B: **Using the scale below, please rate each of the statements as to how YOU were during the disagreement:**

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

During the disagreement, I was mainly:

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
20. Taking the lead	0	1	2	3	4
21. Following	0	1	2	3	4
22. Working together	0	1	2	3	4
23. Distant	0	1	2	3	4
24. Determined	0	1	2	3	4
25. Agreeing	0	1	2	3	4
26. Able to compromise	0	1	2	3	4
27. Independent	0	1	2	3	4
28. Critical	0	1	2	3	4
29. Mixed feelings	0	1	2	3	4
30. Excited & Emotional	0	1	2	3	4
31. Feeling deeply	0	1	2	3	4
32. Talkative & Businesslike	0	1	2	3	4
33. Quiet & Unemotional	0	1	2	3	4

C: Using the scale below, please rate each of the statements as to how <u>YOU</u> acted during the disagreement

During the disagreement,

How much...?

		Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
34.	Did you talk?	0	1	2	3	4
35.	Were you attentive to what your partner was trying to get across?	0	1	2	3	4
36.	Did you tend to agree with or accept your partner's ideas or suggestions?	0	1	2	3	4
37.	Were you critical or disapproving towards your partner?	0	1	2	3	4
38.	Did you take initiative in defining the issues that were talked about?	0	1	2	3	4
39.	Did you try to change your partner's point of view or way of doing things?	0	1	2	3	4
40.	Did you express your feelings?	0	1	2	3	4
41.	Were you able to focus on what was of present concern to you?	0	1	2	3	4
42.	Were you logical and organized in expressing thoughts and feelings?	0	1	2	3	4
43.	Were your feelings stirred up?	0	1	2	3	4
44.	Were you self-critical or self-rejecting?	0	1	2	3	4
45.	Were you able to freely produce ideas and associations?	0	1	2	3	4
46.	Were you spontaneous?	0	1	2	3	4
47.	Did you retain effective control over your actions and expressions?	0	1	2	3	4
48.	Were you satisfied or pleased with your own behaviour?	0	1	2	3	4

III. YOUR PARTNER

A: **Using the scale below, please circle the number next to <u>each</u> of the adjectives that best describes how <u>YOUR PARTNER</u> was feeling during the disagreement:**

E.g. Sad_(2)_ (This means that your partner was moderately sad)

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
49. Thoughtful	0	1	2	3	4
50. Annoyed	0	1	2	3	4
51. Bored	0	1	2	3	4
52. Sympathetic	0	1	2	3	4
53. Frustrated	0	1	2	3	4
54. Involved	0	1	2	3	4
55. Demanding	0	1	2	3	4
56. Apprehensive	0	1	2	3	4
57. Effective	0	1	2	3	4
58. Perplexed	0	1	2	3	4
59. Detached	0	1	2	3	4
60. Confident	0	1	2	3	4
61. Interested	0	1	2	3	4
62. Unsure	0	1	2	3	4
63. Optimistic	0	1	2	3	4
64. Distracted	0	1	2	3	4
65. Alert	0	1	2	3	4
66. Tired	0	1	2	3	4
67. Headachey or ill	0	1	2	3	4

B: **Using the scale below, please rate each of the statements as to how you think**

YOURPARTNER would describe herself during the disagreement:

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

During the disagreement, I think my partner said she was mainly:

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
68. Taking the lead	0	1	2	3	4
69. Following	0	1	2	3	4
70. Working together	0	1	2	3	4
71. Distant	0	1	2	3	4
72. Determined	0	1	2	3	4
73. Agreeing	0	1	2	3	4
74. Able to compromise	0	1	2	3	4
75. Independent	0	1	2	3	4
76. Critical	0	1	2	3	4
77. Mixed feelings	0	1	2	3	4
78. Excited & Emotional	0	1	2	3	4
79. Feeling deeply	0	1	2	3	4
80. Talkative & Businesslike	0	1	2	3	4
81. Quiet & Unemotional	0	1	2	3	4

C: Using the scale below, please rate each of the statements as to how you think YOUR PARTNER would describe how she acted during the disagreement

During the disagreement,

How much...?

		Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
82.	Did your partner say she talked?	0	1	2	3	4
83.	Did your partner say she was attentive to what you were trying to get across?	0	1	2	3	4
84.	Did your partner say she tended to agree with or accept your comments or suggestions?	0	1	2	3	4
85.	Did your partner say she was critical or disapproving towards you?	0	1	2	3	4
86.	Did your partner say she took initiative in defining the issues that were talked about?	0	1	2	3	4
87.	Did your partner say she tried to change your of point of view or way of doing things?	0	1	2	3	4
88.	Did your partner say she expressed her feelings?	0	1	2	3	4
89.	Did your partner say she was able to focus on what was of present concern to her?	0	1	2	3	4
90.	Did your partner say she was logical and organized in expressing thoughts and feelings?	0	1	2	3	4
91.	Did your partner say her feelings were stirred up?	0	1	2	3	4
92.	Did your partner say she was self-critical or self-rejecting?	0	1	2	3	4
93.	Did your partner say she was able to freely produce ideas and associations?	0	1	2	3	4
94.	Did your partner say she was spontaneous?	0	1	2	3	4
95.	Did your partner say she retained effective control over her actions and expressions?	0	1	2	3	4
96.	Did your partner say she was satisfied or pleased with her own behaviour?	0	1	2	3	4

IV. Your partner on you

A: Using the scale below, please circle the number next to <u>each</u> of the adjectives that best describes how your partner thought <u>YOU</u> were during the disagreement:

E.g. Sad_(2)_ (This means that your partner felt that you were moderately sad)

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
97. Thoughtful	0	1	2	3	4
98. Annoyed	0	1	2	3	4
99. Bored	0	1	2	3	4
100. Sympathetic	0	1	2	3	4
101. Frustrated	0	1	2	3	4
102. Involved	0	1	2	3	4
103. Demanding	0	1	2	3	4
104. Apprehensive	0	1	2	3	4
105. Effective	0	1	2	3	4
106. Perplexed	0	1	2	3	4
107. Detached	0	1	2	3	4
108. Confident	0	1	2	3	4
109. Interested	0	1	2	3	4
110. Unsure	0	1	2	3	4
111. Optimistic	0	1	2	3	4
112. Distracted	0	1	2	3	4
113. Alert	0	1	2	3	4
114. Tired	0	1	2	3	4
115. Headachey or ill	0	1	2	3	4

The following set of questions concern how your partner thought you were feeling about her.

B: Using the scale below, please circle the number next to <u>each</u> of the adjectives that best describes how your partner thought you were feeling about <u>HER</u> during the disagreement:

E.g. Sad_(2)_ (This means that your partner felt you thought she was moderately sad)

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
116. Thoughtful	0	1	2	3	4
117. Annoyed	0	1	2	3	4
118. Bored	0	1	2	3	4
119. Sympathetic	0	1	2	3	4
120. Frustrated	0	1	2	3	4
121. Involved	0	1	2	3	4
122. Demanding	0	1	2	3	4
123. Apprehensive	0	1	2	3	4
124. Effective	0	1	2	3	4
125. Perplexed	0	1	2	3	4
126. Detached	0	1	2	3	4
127. Confident	0	1	2	3	4
128. Interested	0	1	2	3	4
129. Unsure	0	1	2	3	4
130. Optimistic	0	1	2	3	4
131. Distracted	0	1	2	3	4
132. Alert	0	1	2	3	4
133. Tired	0	1	2	3	4
134. Headachey or ill	0	1	2	3	4

I. THE ISSUE

Appendix 2.5b: DRFQ female

Issue: _____

You and your partner jointly selected the issue concerning _____ as a major topic of disagreement between you. Following are some questions concerning this issue. Please answer the questions to the best of your ability.

II. YOU

A: **Using the scale below, please circle the number next to <u>each</u> of the adjectives that best describes <u>YOU</u> during the disagreement:**

E.g. Sad_(2)_ (This means that you felt moderately sad)

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1. Thoughtful	0	1	2	3	4
2. Annoyed	0	1	2	3	4
3. Bored	0	1	2	3	4
4. Sympathetic	0	1	2	3	4
5. Frustrated	0	1	2	3	4
6. Involved	0	1	2	3	4
7. Demanding	0	1	2	3	4
8. Apprehensive	0	1	2	3	4
9. Effective	0	1	2	3	4
10. Perplexed	0	1	2	3	4
11. Detached	0	1	2	3	4
12. Confident	0	1	2	3	4
13. Interested	0	1	2	3	4
14. Unsure	0	1	2	3	4
15. Optimistic	0	1	2	3	4
16. Distracted	0	1	2	3	4
17. Alert	0	1	2	3	4
18. Tired	0	1	2	3	4
19. Headachey or ill	0	1	2	3	4

B: **Using the scale below, please rate each of the statements as to how YOU were during the disagreement:**

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

During the disagreement, I was mainly:

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
20. Taking the lead	0	1	2	3	4
21. Following	0	1	2	3	4
22. Working together	0	1	2	3	4
23. Distant	0	1	2	3	4
24. Determined	0	1	2	3	4
25. Agreeing	0	1	2	3	4
26. Able to compromise	0	1	2	3	4
27. Independent	0	1	2	3	4
28. Critical	0	1	2	3	4
29. Mixed feelings	0	1	2	3	4
30. Excited & Emotional	0	1	2	3	4
31. Feeling deeply	0	1	2	3	4
32. Talkative & Businesslike	0	1	2	3	4
33. Quiet & Unemotional	0	1	2	3	4

C: Using the scale below, please rate each of the statements as to how YOU acted during the disagreement

During the disagreement,

How much...?

		Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
34.	Did you talk?	0	1	2	3	4
35.	Were you attentive to what your partner was trying to get across?	0	1	2	3	4
36.	Did you tend to agree with or accept your partner's ideas or suggestions?	0	1	2	3	4
37.	Were you critical or disapproving towards your partner?	0	1	2	3	4
38.	Did you take initiative in defining the issues that were talked about?	0	1	2	3	4
39.	Did you try to change your partner's point of view or way of doing things?	0	1	2	3	4
40.	Did you express your feelings?	0	1	2	3	4
41.	Were you able to focus on what was of present concern to you?	0	1	2	3	4
42.	Were you logical and organized in expressing thoughts and feelings?	0	1	2	3	4
43.	Were your feelings stirred up?	0	1	2	3	4
44.	Were you self-critical or self-rejecting?	0	1	2	3	4
45.	Were you able to freely produce ideas and associations?	0	1	2	3	4
46.	Were you spontaneous?	0	1	2	3	4
47.	Did you retain effective control over your actions and expressions?	0	1	2	3	4
48.	Were you satisfied or pleased with your own behaviour?	0	1	2	3	4

III. YOUR PARTNER

A: **Using the scale below, please circle the number next to <u>each</u> of the adjectives that best describes how <u>YOUR PARTNER</u> was feeling during the disagreement:**

E.g. Sad_(2)_ (This means that your partner was moderately sad)

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
49. Thoughtful	0	1	2	3	4
50. Annoyed	0	1	2	3	4
51. Bored	0	1	2	3	4
52. Sympathetic	0	1	2	3	4
53. Frustrated	0	1	2	3	4
54. Involved	0	1	2	3	4
55. Demanding	0	1	2	3	4
56. Apprehensive	0	1	2	3	4
57. Effective	0	1	2	3	4
58. Perplexed	0	1	2	3	4
59. Detached	0	1	2	3	4
60. Confident	0	1	2	3	4
61. Interested	0	1	2	3	4
62. Unsure	0	1	2	3	4
63. Optimistic	0	1	2	3	4
64. Distracted	0	1	2	3	4
65. Alert	0	1	2	3	4
66. Tired	0	1	2	3	4
67. Headachey or ill	0	1	2	3	4

B: **Using the scale below, please rate each of the statements as to how you think YOUR PARTNER would describe himself during the disagreement:**

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

During the disagreement, I think my partner said he was mainly:

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
68. Taking the lead	0	1	2	3	4
69. Following	0	1	2	3	4
70. Working together	0	1	2	3	4
71. Distant	0	1	2	3	4
72. Determined	0	1	2	3	4
73. Agreeing	0	1	2	3	4
74. Able to compromise	0	1	2	3	4
75. Independent	0	1	2	3	4
76. Critical	0	1	2	3	4
77. Mixed feelings	0	1	2	3	4
78. Excited & Emotional	0	1	2	3	4
79. Feeling deeply	0	1	2	3	4
80. Talkative & Businesslike	0	1	2	3	4
81. Quiet & Unemotional	0	1	2	3	4

C: Using the scale below, please rate each of the statements as to how you think YOUR PARTNER would describe how he acted during the disagreement

During the disagreement,

How much...?

		Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
82.	Did your partner say he talked?	0	1	2	3	4
83.	Did your partner say he was attentive to what you were trying to get across?	0	1	2	3	4
84.	Did your partner say he tended to agree with or accept your comments or suggestions?	0	1	2	3	4
85.	Did your partner say he was critical or disapproving towards you?	0	1	2	3	4
86.	Did your partner say he took initiative in defining the issues that were talked about?	0	1	2	3	4
87.	Did your partner say he tried to change your of point of view or way of doing things?	0	1	2	3	4
88.	Did your partner say he expressed his feelings?	0	1	2	3	4
89.	Did your partner say he was able to focus on what was of present concern to him?	0	1	2	3	4
90.	Did your partner say he was logical and organized in expressing thoughts and feelings?	0	1	2	3	4
91.	Did your partner say his feelings were stirred up?	0	1	2	3	4
92.	Did your partner say he was self-critical or self-rejecting?	0	1	2	3	4
93.	Did your partner say he was able to freely produce ideas and associations?	0	1	2	3	4
94.	Did your partner say he was spontaneous?	0	1	2	3	4
95.	Did your partner say he retained effective control over his actions and expressions?	0	1	2	3	4
96.	Did your partner say he was satisfied or pleased with his own behaviour?	0	1	2	3	4

IV. Your partner on you

A: Using the scale below, please circle the number next to <u>each</u> of the adjectives that best describes how your partner thought <u>YOU</u> were during the disagreement:

E.g. Sad_(2)_ (This means that your partner felt that you were moderately sad)

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
97. Thoughtful	0	1	2	3	4
98. Annoyed	0	1	2	3	4
99. Bored	0	1	2	3	4
100. Sympathetic	0	1	2	3	4
101. Frustrated	0	1	2	3	4
102. Involved	0	1	2	3	4
103. Demanding	0	1	2	3	4
104. Apprehensive	0	1	2	3	4
105. Effective	0	1	2	3	4
106. Perplexed	0	1	2	3	4
107. Detached	0	1	2	3	4
108. Confident	0	1	2	3	4
109. Interested	0	1	2	3	4
110. Unsure	0	1	2	3	4
111. Optimistic	0	1	2	3	4
112. Distracted	0	1	2	3	4
113. Alert	0	1	2	3	4
114. Tired	0	1	2	3	4
115. Headachey or ill	0	1	2	3	4

The following set of questions concern how your partner thought you were feeling about him.

B: Using the scale below, please circle the number next to <u>each</u> of the adjectives that best describes how your partner thought you were feeling about <u>HIM</u> during the disagreement:

E.g. Sad_(2)_ (This means that your partner felt you thought he was moderately sad)

Scale

0 = Not at all
1 = A little bit
2 = Moderately
3 = Quite a bit
4 = Extremely

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
116. Thoughtful	0	1	2	3	4
117. Annoyed	0	1	2	3	4
118. Bored	0	1	2	3	4
119. Sympathetic	0	1	2	3	4
120. Frustrated	0	1	2	3	4
121. Involved	0	1	2	3	4
122. Demanding	0	1	2	3	4
123. Apprehensive	0	1	2	3	4
124. Effective	0	1	2	3	4
125. Perplexed	0	1	2	3	4
126. Detached	0	1	2	3	4
127. Confident	0	1	2	3	4
128. Interested	0	1	2	3	4
129. Unsure	0	1	2	3	4
130. Optimistic	0	1	2	3	4
131. Distracted	0	1	2	3	4
132. Alert	0	1	2	3	4
133. Tired	0	1	2	3	4
134. Headachey or ill	0	1	2	3	4

Appendix 2.6: FBS

FAMILY BEHAVIOUR SURVEY-PART 1

All couples have disagreements and arguments. We are interested in the issues about which you and your partner disagree. The items listed below were collected from interviews with average couples. Please choose from the list below, the one disagreement that has been most prominent for you as a couple during the last six months.

1. Handling finances
2. How to spend holidays and free times
3. Friends
4. Employment and career decisions
5. Amount of time spent together
6. Household tasks and maintenance
7. Warmth, affection in our relationship
8. Religious matters
9. Leisure time, interests and activities
10. Values, attitudes and goals
11. Correct or proper behaviour
12. Ways of dealing with in-laws and parents
13. Sexual matters and family planning
14. Giving or not giving gifts to each other
15. Getting jealous
16. The wedding
17. Not showing love or commitment
18. Other (specify)

Appendix 3.1: Gender differences in test-retest reliability

Table 3.1: Mann-Whitney U scores for the male vs. female test-retest reliability scores

Variable	Mann-Whitney U (N=6)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher	18.00	1.00
ICC	2.00	.40
T-value	12.00	1.00
T-test	12.00	1.00
Absolute difference	5.50*	.041

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Appendix 4.1: Study ad

COUPLES WANTED

For a study on couples' communication conducted in cooperation with University College London and London Marriage Guidance Council

Participation will help to enhance therapeutic work with couples

ALL PARTICIPATING COUPLES WILL RECEIVE A WATERSTONES GIFT VOUCHER UPON COMPLETION

Please email David at:

All responses are completely confidential and protected by UCL's Data Protection Act.

Appendix 4.2a: Information sheet (general population)

Principal Investigators: **Dr. Peter Fonagy**
Psychoanalysis Unit
University College London
Gower Street
London WC1E 6BT

David Younger
Psychology Department
University College London
Gower Street
London WC1E 6BT

PERSPECTIVE-TAKING AND COUPLES INTERACTIONS

Thank you for participating in this study. Before you begin, it is important that you understand why this research is being conducted and what it will involve. Please read carefully the following information regarding the study. You can contact me at any time if you require further information.

What is the purpose of the study?

The study aims to look at ways in which couples handle different situations, and how individuals think about their own thoughts and actions and their partner's thoughts and actions. It will help to explore useful ways to work with couples in therapy.

Why have I been asked to participate?

You are being asked to participate in this study because I am interested in receiving feedback from couples in the general population.

Do I have to take part?

It is completely up to you whether you participate in the study or not. If you do decide to take part, you can have a copy of this information sheet and you will be asked to sign an informed consent form, which you will be given a copy of as well. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time for whatever reason.

What will happen if I take part, and what will that entail?

If you decide to participate in this study, you can call or email me to let me know. We will then arrange a time to meet. We will then review the information sheet again and you will be asked to sign an informed consent form. You will be asked to individually complete a word pronunciation task that should take 3-4 minutes and a questionnaire on perspective taking, which should take 20-30 minutes.
I will then give you and your partner a short packet of questionnaires to take home with you and complete on your own time as soon as you can. I will also give you a self-addressed stamped envelope to return the form to me upon completion. Once I receive the questionnaires, I will send you your gift voucher in appreciation for participating in the study. You might be asked if you would be willing to be contacted for follow-up in the future.

Are there any risks or downsides in participating in this study?

There are no risks in becoming involved. You will not be able to be identified from any of the findings.

What are the advantages of participating?
Participating in this study will hopefully be an enriching and interesting experience for you. It will be an enormous help to me, and it will add to the important investigation of couple communication and the therapeutic process. You will also receive a generous gift voucher upon completion of the study.

What happens when the study ends?
Once you return the questionnaires, your participation is over. As aforementioned, you might be asked if you would be willing to be contacted for follow-up in the future. You will receive your gift voucher once the questionnaires are completed and returned to me.

What if something goes wrong?
If you are unhappy for whatever reason with any aspect of the study, you should contact me, preferably via email, at the given address.

Will my participation be confidential?
All data will be collected and stored in accordance with UCL's Data Protection Act. It will be retained for a period of three years and then disposed of in a secure manner.
All information will remain completely confidential.
No one will be notified of your participation in this study, nor will they have any access to your personal responses.

What will happen to the results of the research in this study?
Data from this study might be used in subsequent research. All participants have the option of receiving feedback on the results. For further information concerning feedback, please contact David Younger (see contact info. below).

Who is overseeing the study?
This study is being conducted under the auspices of University College London and London Marriage Guidance Council and was approved by UCL's Committee for the Ethics of Non-NHS Human Research.

For further information, please contact:
Mr. David Younger
University College London
Department of Psychology

Appendix 4.2b: Information sheet (LMG)

Principal Investigators: **Dr. Peter Fonagy**
Psychoanalysis Unit
University College London
Gower Street
London WC1E 6BT

David Younger
Psychology Department
University College London
Gower Street
London WC1E 6BT

PERSPECTIVE-TAKING AND COUPLES INTERACTIONS

Thank you for participating in this study. Before you begin, it is important that you understand why this research is being conducted and what it will involve. Please read carefully the following information regarding the study. You can contact me at any time if you require further information.

What is the purpose of the study?

The study aims to look at ways in which couples handle different situations, and how individuals think about their own thoughts and actions and their partner's thoughts and actions. It will help to explore useful ways to work with couples in therapy.

Why have I been asked to participate?

You are being asked to participate in this study because you are currently attending counselling sessions at London Marriage Guidance Council.

Do I have to take part?
It is completely up to you whether you participate in the study or not. If you do decide to take part, you can have a copy of this information sheet and you will be asked to sign an informed consent form, which you will be given a copy of as well. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time for whatever reason. Your participation, or decision not to participate in this study will have absolutely no affect on the care that you receive at LMG.

What will happen if I take part, and what will that entail?
If you decide to participate in this study, you can call or email me to let me know. We will then arrange a time to meet, either before or after one of your sessions in a private room, or at an otherwise arranged time and place. We will then review the information sheet again and you will be asked to sign an informed consent form. You will be asked to individually complete a word pronunciation task that should take 3-4 minutes and a questionnaire on perspective-taking, which should take 20-30 minutes.

I will then give you each a packet of questionnaires to take home with you and complete on your own time as soon as you can. I will also give you a self-addressed stamped envelope to return the form to me upon completion. Once I receive the questionnaires, I will send you your gift voucher in appreciation for participating in the study. You might be asked if you would be willing to be contacted for follow-up in the future.

Are there any risks or downsides in participating in this study?
There are no risks in becoming involved. Your participation will not have any impact on your counselling sessions and you will not be able to be identified from any of the findings.

What are the advantages of participating?
Participating in this study will hopefully be an enriching and interesting experience for you. It will be an enormous help to me, and it will add to the important investigation of couple communication and the therapeutic process. You will also receive a generous gift voucher upon completion of the study.

What happens when the study ends?
Once you return the questionnaires, your participation is over. As aforementioned, you might be asked if you would be willing to be contacted for follow-up in the future. You will receive your gift voucher once the questionnaires are completed and returned to me.

What if something goes wrong?
If you are unhappy for whatever reason with any aspect of the study, you should contact me, preferably via email, at the given address.

Will my participation be confidential?
All data will be collected and stored in accordance with UCL's Data Protection Act. It will be retained for a period of three years and then disposed of in a secure manner.
All information will remain completely confidential.
No one, including your counsellor, will be notified of your participation in this study, nor will they have any access to your personal responses.

What will happen to the results of the research in this study?
Data from this study might be used in subsequent research. All participants have the option of receiving feedback on the results. For further information concerning feedback, please contact David Younger (see contact info. below).

Who is overseeing the study?
This study is being conducted under the auspices of University College London and London Marriage Guidance Council and was approved by UCL's Committee for the Ethics of Non-NHS Human Research.

For further information, please contact:
Mr. David Younger
University College London
Department of Psychology

Instructions

1. Read the information sheet titled "Perspective taking and couples interactions" along with your partner.

2. Ask any questions that you might have before signing and dating the consent form that follows. You must both sign and return the consent form.

3. Each of you should then complete the demographic questions.

4. With your partner, briefly review the list of disagreements titled "FBS". Choose the one issue that is most relevant for you as a couple as a disagreement in the past six months. Try not to spend too much time deciding.

5. Write the mutually selected issue in the two spaces available at the top of the first questionnaire where it says: "Issue" and "You and your partner jointly selected the issue concerning..." (It is important that you are both thinking about the last time you disagreed on this issue when you complete the first questionnaire, pgs. 1 – 8).

6. Read the instructions and complete the questionnaire. This will be completed independently of your partner, as will the remainder of the questionnaires. It is important not to look at each other's responses, or to consult with each other regarding responses.

7. Complete the remaining questionnaires.

8. Come to me with any questions or concerns.

- Pages are double-sided.
- Please answer every question and do not spend too much time on any one question.

Appendix 4.4: Consent form

Healthy Volunteer Consent Form

A study on perspective-taking and couples interactions

Name of Participant:

Contact Address:

Have you read the information sheet about this study?	YES/NO
Have you had the opportunity to ask questions and discuss this study?	YES/NO
Have you received satisfactory answers to all your questions?	YES/NO
Have you received enough information about this study?	YES/NO

Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from this study…

*at any time	YES/NO
*without giving a reason for withdrawing	YES/NO

Do you agree to take part in this study? YES/NO

Signature of participant Dated

Signature of investigator Dated

Appendix 4.5: Results main study (application of the DRFQ)

Appendix 4.5.1: Correlations between DRF accuracy scores and demographic variables

Table 4.5.1: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female religiousness and their respective affect ratings concerning how each felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	-.086	.490	.106	.364
Mean female on self	.089	.473	.076	.516
Fisher male-female on self	-.187	.130	.160	.168
Difference male-female on self	-.047	.707	.066	.569

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.2: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for how men and women rated their parents' marital satisfaction and their respective affect ratings concerning how each felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	.047	.711	-.161	.165
Mean female on self	.113	.372	-.002	.988
Fisher male-female on self	-.130	.307	.111	.342
Difference male-female on self	-.059	.641	-.064	.582

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.3: T-value for male and female level of education and their respective affect ratings concerning how each felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	-1.125	.268	-1.239	.219
Mean female on self	-1.023	.309	.044	.965
Fisher male-female on self	1.122	.265	.220	.826
Difference male-female on self	-.135	.893	-1.065	.289

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.4: F-value for couples' marital status and their respective affect ratings concerning how each felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ

Variable	Couples (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	.693	.503
Mean female on self	.199	.820
Fisher male-female on self	.847	.432
Difference male-female on self	.323	.725

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.5: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for how long couples were together and their respective affect ratings concerning how each felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ

Variable	Couples (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	-.212*	.038
Mean female on self	-.080	.441
Fisher male-female on self	.181	.078
Difference male-female on self	-.141	.170

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.6: T-value for male and female whether they were in therapy and their respective affect ratings concerning how each felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	2.149*	.034	1.993*	.049
Mean female on self	2.355*	.021	2.309*	.023
Fisher male-female on self	-.833	.407	-.257	.798
Difference male-female on self	-.319	.750	-.403	.688

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.7: T-value for male and female ethnicity and their respective affect ratings concerning how each felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on self	-.692	.491	-1.171	.245
Mean female on self	-.154	.878	.398	.691
Fisher male-female on self	2.443*	.016	1.018	.311
Difference male-female on self	-.434	.665	-1.335	.185

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.8: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for how men and women rated their parents' marital satisfaction and men's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	.090	.482	-.079	.497
Fisher male on self-female on male	-.061	.633	.023	.847
Difference male on self-female on male	-.029	.823	-.012	.917

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.9: T-value for male and female ethnicity and men's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	.645	.520	.164	.870
Fisher male on self-female on male	1.886	.062	1.144	.255
Difference male on self-female on male	-1.252	.214	-1.168	.246

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.10: T-value for male and female education and men's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	-1.879	.063	-1.046	.298
Fisher male on self-female on male	-.173	.863	-1.799	.075
Difference male on self-female on male	.072	.789	.003	.998

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.11: F-value for couples' marital status and men's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought their partners felt

Variable	Couples (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	1.712	.186
Fisher male on self-female on male	.576	.564
Difference male on self-female on male	1.164	.317

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.12: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female stated degree of religiousness and men's affect *ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement* they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	-.002	.988	-.155	.183
Fisher male on self-female on male	-.232	.059	-.008	.943
Difference male on self-female on male	-.018	.886	.242*	.035

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.13: T-value for male and female with or without children and men's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	.959	.340	2.458*	.016
Fisher male on self-female on male	.701	.485	.367	.714
Difference male on self-female on male	1.794	.076	.850	.397

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.14: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for how long couples were together and men's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought their partners felt

Variable	Couples (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	-.006	.952
Fisher male on self-female on male	.146	.157
Difference male on self-female on male	-.241*	.048

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.15: T-value for male and female whether or not they are in therapy and men's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male	2.469*	.015	1.844	.073
Fisher male on self-female on male	-.673	.503	-1.996*	.049
Difference male on self-female on male	-.630	.531	-.421	.675

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.16: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female age and women's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	-.037	.723	-.089	.390
Fisher female on self-male on female	.091	.376	.088	.395
Difference female on self-male on female	-.095	.360	-.097	.349

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.17: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female religiousness and women's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	.044	.725	.022	.851
Fisher female on self-male on female	-.132	.286	-.166	.152
Difference female on self-male on female	-.006	.962	.064	.585

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.18: T-value for whether men and women had children and women's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	.996	.322	1.533	.129
Fisher female on self-male on female	1.008	.316	.741	.161
Difference female on self-male on female	.060	.952	1.235	.220

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.19: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for how long couples were together and women's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	-.125	.225
Fisher female on self-male on female	.018	.865
Difference female on self-male on female	.036	.727

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.20: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for how men and women rated their parents' marital satisfaction and women's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	-.078	.541	-.070	.549
Fisher female on self-male on female	-.088	.491	-.184	.111
Difference female on self-male on female	.147	.248	.086	.462

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.21: T-value for whether male and female education and women's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	-1.407	.163	-1.772	.080
Fisher female on self-male on female	.439	.662	-.430	.668
Difference female on self-male on female	.225	.823	1.501	.137

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.22: F-value for couples' marital status and women's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	.139	.871
Fisher female on self-male on female	.108	.898
Difference female on self-male on female	.356	.702

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.23: T-value for male and female whether or not they were in therapy and women's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	.225	.823	-.016	.987
Fisher female on self-male on female	-1.215	.227	-1.215	.227
Difference female on self-male on female	1.943	.055	2.114*	.037

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.24: T-value for male and female ethnicity and women's affect ratings concerning how they felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought their partners felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female	.789	.432	-.284	.777
Fisher female on self-male on female	2.416*	.018	1.816	.073
Difference female on self-male on female	-.794	.429	.599	.550

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.25: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female age and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men thought women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought women felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female	.009	.932	-.028	.790
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	.068	.510	.031	.767
Difference female on male on female-male on female	.018	.860	.042	.687

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.26: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female religiousness and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men thought women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought women felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female	.110	.376	-.040	.728
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	-.021	.866	.057	.628
Difference female on male on female-male on female	.048	.702	-.064	.580

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.27: T-value for whether men and women had children and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men thought women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought women felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female	-.300	.765	1.730	.087
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	-.069	.945	-.176	.860
Difference female on male on female-male on female	-1.166	.247	.266	.791

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.28: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for how long couples were together and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men thought women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought women felt

Variable	Couples (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female	.073	.451
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	.044	.673
Difference female on male on female-male on female	.184	.073

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.29: T-value for whether men and women were in therapy and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men thought women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought women felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female	.629	.531	.735	.464
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	-1.319	.190	-1.449	.151
Difference female on male on female-male on female	.393	.695	.707	.481

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.30: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of their parents' marital satisfaction and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men thought women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought women felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female	.002	.989	-.035	.767
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	-.160	.208	.005	.964
Difference female on male on female-male on female	.071	.576	.039	.739

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.31: T-value for male and female ethnicity and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men thought women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought women felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female	.682	.497	1.043	.300
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	1.307	.194	.736	.464
Difference female on male on female-male on female	-.054	.957	1.238	.219

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.32: T-value for male and female education and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men thought women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought women felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female	-1.291	.200	-.721	.472
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	-1.463	.147	-.056	.955
Difference female on male on female-male on female	.024	.981	.868	.388

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.33: F-value for couples' marital status and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men thought women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men thought women felt

Variable	Couples (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female	.818	.445
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	.357	.701
Difference female on male on female-male on female	.696	.501

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.34: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women thought men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought men felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male	.218	.076	.022	.848
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	-.066	.595	.032	.782
Difference male on female on male-female on male	-.238	.053	-.021	.860

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.35: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of their parents' marital satisfaction and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women thought men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought men felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male	-.075	.558	-.052	.658
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	-.081	.522	.024	.837
Difference male on female on male-female on male	-.170	.180	.020	.862

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.36: T-value for male and female ethnicity and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women thought men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought men felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male	.176	.861	-.993	.323
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	.873	.385	1.088	.279
Difference male on female on male-female on male	-.487	.627	-1.077	.284

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.37: T-value for male and female education and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women thought men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought men felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male	-1.081	.283	-.495	.621
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	-.673	.503	-1.893	.063
Difference male on female on male-female on male	.873	.385	.593	.555

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.38: F-value for couples' marital status and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women thought men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought men felt

Variable	Couples (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male	2.071	.132
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	.534	.588
Difference male on female on male-female on male	1.130	.327

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.39: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female age and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women thought men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought men felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male	-.165	.109	-.202*	.048
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	.018	.864	.071	.493
Difference male on female on male-female on male	-.175	.089	-.105	.310

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.40: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female religiousness and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women thought men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought men felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male	.067	.591	.121	.299
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	-.283*	.021	.055	.637
Difference male on female on male-female on male	.106	.392	.226*	.050

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.41: T-Value for men and women, whether they had children, and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women thought men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought men felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male	1.573	.119	2.257*	.026
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	-.834	.406	-.217	.829
Difference male on female on male-female on male	.502	.617	-.380	.705

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.42: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for how long couples have been together and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women thought men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought men felt

Variable	Couples (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male	-.149	.147
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	.225*	.027
Difference male on female on male-female on male	-.162	.114

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.43: T-Value for men and women, whether they were in therapy, and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women thought men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women thought men felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male	1.736	.086	1.915	.059
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	-.931	.354	-2.145*	.035
Difference male on female on male-female on male	-.841	.402	-.293	.771

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.44: Spearman's correlation coefficient for female religiousness and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men said women said that men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what men said women thought about how men felt

Variable	Male (N=67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female on male	-.003	.979	-.024	.840
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.211	.086	-.137	.237
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.074	.551	-.140	.228

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.45: Spearman's correlation coefficient for how long couples were together and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men said women said that men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what men said women thought about how men felt

Variable	Couples (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female on male	.042	.686
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	.130	.211
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	.165	.111

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.46: T-value for male and female ethnicity and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men said women said that men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what men said women thought about how men felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female on male	-.166	.869	.540	.590
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	1.918	.058	1.290	.200
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.316	.753	1.418	.160

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.47: T-value for male and female education and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men said women said that men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what men said women thought about how men felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female on male	-1.093	.277	-.384	.702
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.764	.447	-1.944	.055
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.064	.949	.083	.934

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.48: F-value for couples' marital status and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men said women said that men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what men said women thought about how men felt

Variable	Couples (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female on male	.576	.564
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	.310	.734
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	1.180	.312

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.49: Spearman's correlation coefficient for female age and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men said women said that men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what men said women thought about how men felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female on male	-.054	.600	-.084	.418
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	.178	.083	.237*	.020
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	.071	.489	.065	.529

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.50: T-value for whether men and women had children and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men said women said that men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what men said women thought about how men felt

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female on male	.720	.473	2.304*	.023
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-1.068	.288	-1.716	.090
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.793	.454	.140	.889

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.51: Spearman's correlation coefficient for men and women's ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men said women said that men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what men said women thought about how men felt

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female on male	.293*	.016	.096	.411
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.036	.773	-.054	.646
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	.172	.165	.108	.355

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.52: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of parents' marital satisfaction and women's affect ratings concerning what they thought that men said women said that men felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what men said women thought about how men felt

Variable	Male (N =64)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N =64)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean female on male on female on male	.121	.341	-.146	.208
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.129	.310	-.152	.189
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	.264*	.035	-.068	.561

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.53: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female religiousness and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women said men said that women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what women said men thought about how women felt

Variable	Male (N =67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male on female	.034	.786	.006	.962
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.218	.076	-.149	.199
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.054	.663	.100	.390

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.54: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women said men said that women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what women said men thought about how women felt

Variable	Male (N =67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male on female	.141	.257	.017	.884
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.055	.657	.001	.996
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.201	.104	-.092	.431

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.55: T-value for whether or not women and men were in therapy and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women said men said that women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what women said men thought about how women felt

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male on female	1.146	.255	1.154	.251
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-1.173	.244	-.608	.544
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.440	.661	.321	.750

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.56: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of their parents' marital satisfaction and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women said men said that women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what women said men thought about how women felt

Variable	Male (N =67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male on female	-.044	.727	-.063	.589
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.217	.085	-.046	.692
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.066	.604	-.004	.973

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.57: T-value for male and female ethnicity and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women said men said that women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what women said men thought about how women felt

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male on female	.401	.690	.140	.889
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.000	1.000	.188	.851
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.241	.810	-.774	.441

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.58: T-value for male and female education and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women said men said that women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what women said men thought about how women felt

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male on female	-1.560	.127	-1.141	.257
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-1.102	.274	-1.009	.315
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.429	.669	-.356	.722

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.59: F-value for couples' marital status and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women said men said that women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what women said men thought about how women felt

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male on female	.097	.907
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.268	.766
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.366	.694

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.60: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female age and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women said men said that women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what women said men thought about how women felt

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male on female	-.155	.131	-.245*	.016
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.067	.520	.050	.627
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.132	.199	-.171	.096

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.61: T-Value for women with or without children and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women said men said that women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what women said men thought about how women felt

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male on female	1.623	.108	2.555*	.012
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.155	.877	-.476	.635
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	1.672	.098	.663	.509

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.62: Spearman's correlation coefficient for how long couples have been together and men's affect ratings concerning what they thought that women said men said that women felt during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. what women said men thought about how women felt

Variable	Couples (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Mean male on female on male on female	-.170	.099
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.077	.456
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.226*	.028

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.63: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female religiousness and women's ratings concerning how they thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	-.291*	.017	-.254*	.027
Difference male on self female on male (a)	.137	.270	.064	.586
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	-.204	.100	-.147	.208
Difference male on self female on male (b)	.180	.146	.147	.205

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.64: T-value for men and women with or without children and women's ratings concerning how they thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	.455	.650	.592	.555
Difference male on self female on male (a)	-.154	.878	-1.187	.238
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	.924	.358	1.556	.123
Difference male on self female on male (b)	.106	.916	-1.999*	.048

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.65: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female age and women's ratings concerning how they thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	.054	.602	.041	.689
Difference male on self female on male (a)	-.031	.764	.007	.949
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	-.088	.395	-.010	.926
Difference male on self female on male (b)	.037	.718	-.062	.551

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.66: Spearman's correlation coefficient for how long couples were together and women's ratings concerning how they thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Couples (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	.033	.753
Difference male on self female on male (a)	-.086	.406
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	-.025	.812
Difference male on self female on male (b)	-.026	.804

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.67: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' and women's ratings concerning how they thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	-.210	.089	-.207	.073
Difference male on self female on male (a)	.132	.285	-.006	.958
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	.073	.558	.132	.260
Difference male on self female on male (b)	.058	.644	-.068	.560

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.68: T-value for whether men and women were in therapy and women's ratings concerning how they thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	-.840	.403	-1.223	.224
Difference male on self female on male (a)	-.675	.501	-.569	.571
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	.859	.393	-.557	.579
Difference male on self female on male (b)	-.977	.331	.529	.598

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.69: T-value for male and female ethnicity and women's ratings concerning how they thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	1.155	.251	-.224	.823
Difference male on self female on male (a)	-1.293	.199	.405	.687
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	.970	.335	-.127	.900
Difference male on self female on male (b)	-1.686	.095	-.633	.528

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.70: F-value for couples' marital status and women's ratings concerning how they thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Couples (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	.377	.687
Difference male on self female on male (a)	.122	.886
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	.163	.850
Difference male on self female on male (b)	.168	.846

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.71: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female age and men's ratings concerning how they thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	.145	.158	-.023	.825
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	-.043	.675	.053	.610
Fisher female on self-male on male (b)	-.025	.811	-.079	.449
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	-.063	.544	-.074	.473

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.72: T-value for whether men and women had children and men's ratings concerning how they thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	-.069	.945	.949	.345
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	-.157	.876	-1.512	.134
Fisher female on self-male on male (b)	1.476	.143	1.094	.277
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	-.284	.777	-.631	.529

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.73: Spearman's correlation coefficient for how long couples were together and men's ratings concerning how they thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Couples (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	.074	.472
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	-.022	.828
Fisher female on self-male on male (b)	.073	.481
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	-.158	.125

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.74: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of the happiness of their relationships compared to friends' and men's ratings concerning how they thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	-.131	.292	-.075	.519
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	.009	.942	.008	.948
Fisher female on self-male on male (b)	-.060	.633	-.060	.608
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	-.008	.946	-.179	.122

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.75: T-value for whether men and women were in therapy and men's ratings concerning how they thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	-1.147	.254	-1.552	.124
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	.474	.637	.441	.660
Fisher female on self-male on male (b)	-1.035	.304	-1.227	.223
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	.535	.594	.659	.511

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.76: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female ratings of their parents' marital satisfaction and men's ratings concerning how they thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	-.134	.293	-.215	.062
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	.065	.610	.162	.163
Fisher female on self-male on male (b)	-.092	.473	-.052	.656
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	.080	.530	-.126	.277

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.77: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female religiousness and men's ratings concerning how they thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =67)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=76)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	-.139	.262	-.219	.058
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	.168	.175	.195	.092
Fisher female on self-male on male (b)	.051	.683	-.200	.086
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	.144	.245	.227*	.048

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.78: T-value for male and female ethnicity and men's ratings concerning how they thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	2.294*	.024	1.691	.094
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	-1.930	.057	-1.616	.110
Fisher female on self-male on female (b)	-.122	.904	.940	.350
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	.214	.831	-1.832	.070

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.79: T-value for male and female level of education and men's ratings concerning how they thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	-2.571*	.012	-1.589	.115
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	2.489*	.015	2.109*	.038
Fisher female on self-male on female (b)	-1.420	.160	-.435	.664
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	.534	.595	1.403	.170

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

4.5.2 DRF & other variables

Table 4.5.80: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for how men thought women said men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male-male on female on male	-.076	.459	-.018	.865
Difference female on male-male on female on male	.064	.534	.136	.187

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.81: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men thought women felt during the disagreement and what women thought men said women thought men felt

Variable	Male Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male on female – female on male on female	-.112	.276	-.069	.506
Difference male on female on male on female – female on male on female	.043	.680	.061	.556
Fisher female on male on female on male – male on female on male	-.015	.882	-.011	.912
Difference female on male on female on male – male on female on male	-.046	.659	.068	.513

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.82: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for what women thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	-.064	.534	-.019	.857
Difference male on self female on male (a)	.168	.101	.104	.314
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	-.096	.356	-.053	.608
Difference male on self female on male (b)	.161	.116	.105	.309

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.83: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for what men thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Male (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	-.182	.077	-.015	.886
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	.174	.089	.032	.754
Fisher female on self-male on female (b)	-.081	.434	-.028	.791
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	-.006	.952	-.032	.754

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.84: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men thought women felt during the disagreement and what women thought men said women thought men felt

Variable	Female Anxiety (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Avoidance (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male on female – female on male on female	-.168	.103	-.067	.516
Difference male on female on male on female – female on male on female	.196	.055	.234*	.022
Fisher female on male on female on male – male on female on male	-.039	.705	.098	.343
Difference female on male on female on male – male on female on male	-.206*	.044	-.158	.125

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.85: Spearman's correlation coefficient for female ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for what men thought that women reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how women said they were and acted

Variable	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female (a)	-.073	.481	-.087	.400
Difference female on self-male on female (a)	.122	.238	.104	.312
Fisher female on self-male on female (b)	-.124	.229	-.065	.529
Difference female on self-male on female (b)	.097	.347	-.041	.690

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.86: Spearman's correlation coefficient for female ECR-R anxiety and avoidance scores and DRF scores for what women thought that men reported concerning how they were and acted respectively during the disagreement they jointly selected on the DRFQ vs. how men said they were and acted

Variable	Female (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self-female on male (a)	-.216*	.035	-.116	.262
Difference male on self female on male (a)	.162	.114	.057	.581
Fisher male on self-female on male (b)	-.084	.421	-.160	.122
Difference male on self female on male (b)	.035	.735	.044	.672

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.87: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female psychological mindedness scores and DRF scores for what men thought women felt vs. how women said they felt and for what women thought men felt vs. how men said they felt

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self-male on female	.048	.645	.044	.670
Difference female on self-male on female	.029	.782	.079	.442
Fisher male on self-female on male	-.040	.696	.096	.353
Difference male on self-female on male	-.029	.781	-.073	.482

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.88: Spearman's correlation coefficient for male and female psychological mindedness scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men felt vs. how women said men felt and for what women thought men said women felt vs. how men said women felt

Variable	Male (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male-male on female on male	.022	.830	.159	.122
Difference female on male-male on female on male	.045	.665	-.071	.491
Fisher male on female-female on male on female	.129	.210	.117	.257
Difference male on female-female on male on female	-.009	.930	.165	.107

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.89: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female psychological mindedness scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men thought women felt during the disagreement vs. what women thought men said women felt

Variable	Male Psychological Mindedness (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Psychological Mindedness (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male on female – female on male on female	.190	.064	.094	.360
Difference male on female on male on female – female on male on female	-.072	.484	-.193	.060

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.90: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female psychological mindedness scores and DRF scores for what women thought men said women thought men felt during the disagreement vs. men said women thought men felt

Variable	Male Psychological Mindedness (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Psychological Mindedness (N=96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male on female on male – male on female on male	.081	.434	.210*	.040
Difference female on male on female on male – male on female on male	-.121	.239	.167	.104

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.91: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for what men thought women felt during the disagreement and for what women thought men felt

Variable	Male EPQ P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Male EPQ E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Male EPQ N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Male EPQ L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female-female on self	.153	.138	-.019	.856	-.137	.185	-.100	.332
Difference male on female-female on self	-.026	.805	-.054	.604	.133	.198	-.064	.535
Fisher female on male-male on self	.184	.073	-.100	.332	-.052	.616	-.018	.861
Difference female on male-male on self	.120	.244	.158	.123	-.031	.762	.141	.171

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.92: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for what men said women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male EPI P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Male EPI E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Male EPI N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Male EPI L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male-male on female on male	.221*	.030	.014	.894	.031	.764	.049	.638
Difference female on male-male on female on male	.084	.414	.110	.288	-.185	.071	.229*	.025

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.93: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for what women said men thought women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male EPQ P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Male EPQ E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Male EPQ N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Male EPQ L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female-female on male on female	-.042	.684	-.026	.803	-.098	.342	-.047	.648
Difference male on female-female on male on female	-.076	.459	-.122	.237	.073	.479	-.175	.089

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.94: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for what men said women thought men said women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male EPQ P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Male EPQ E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Male EPQ N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Male EPQ L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.000	.998	-.102	.323	-.023	.827	-.197	.055
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.134	.193	.124	.229	-.047	.649	.137	.183

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.95: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for how men thought women said women were and acted

Variable	Male EPQ P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Male EPQ E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Male EPQ N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Male EPQ L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women were…)	.133	.197	.025	.809	-.019	.853	-.075	.466
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women acted…)	.122	.239	-.106	.305	-.095	.359	-.062	.548
Difference female on self – male on female (how women were…)	-.120	.244	.015	.883	-.032	.758	.065	.528
Difference female on self – male on female (how women acted…)	-.102	.321	.176	.086	.032	.760	.016	.875

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.96: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for how women thought men said men were and acted

Variable	Male EPI P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Male EPI E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Male EPI N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Male EPI L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men were...)	.195	.057	-.019	.851	.053	.607	-.001	.995
Fisher male on self – female on male (controlling for projection)	.248*	.015	-.034	.740	.073	.478	-.005	.965
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men acted...)	.085	.410	-.119	.250	-.052	.615	.177	.086
Difference male on self – female on male (how men were...)	-.078	.450	.004	.970	.036	.730	-.044	.667
Difference male on self – female on male (how men acted...)	-.090	.385	-.084	.416	.041	.691	-.072	.483

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.97: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for what men thought women felt during the disagreement and for what women thought men felt

Variable	Female EPQ P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Female EPQ E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Female EPQ N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Female EPQ L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female-female on self	.148	.150	-.034	.741	.130	.206	-.151	.141
Difference male on female-female on self	-.113	.274	.122	.235	-.103	.317	.110	.288
Fisher female on male-male on self	.097	.346	-.034	.745	.108	.295	-.100	.332
Difference female on male-male on self	-.040	.699	-.070	.496	.118	.254	-.085	.411

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.98: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for what men said women thought men felt and what women said men thought women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female EPQ P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Female EPQ E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Female EPQ N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Female EPQ L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male-male on female on male	.073	.479	-.003	.980	-.157	.127	.029	.782
Difference female on male-male on female on male	-.047	.648	-.043	.674	.155	.131	-.132	.199
Fisher male on female-female on male on female	.011	.916	.037	.719	.018	.864	.007	.942
Difference male on female-female on male on female	-.069	.506	.129	.212	-.071	.490	.132	.201

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.99: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for what men said women thought men said women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female EPQ P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Female EPQ E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Female EPQ N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Female EPQ L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.046	.658	-.005	.960	-.061	.557	-.089	.387
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.036	.725	-.110	.284	.119	.248	-.027	.792

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.100: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for what women said men thought women said men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female EPI P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Female EPI E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Female EPI N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Female EPI L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male-female on male on female on male	.160	.119	-.073	.480	-.076	.464	-.070	.500
Difference male on female on male-female on male on female on male	.028	.789	-.033	.749	-.174	.090	.219*	.032

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.101: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female EPQ-R S scores and DRF scores for how women thought men said men were and acted during the disagreement

Variable	Female EPQ P (N =96)	Sig.(2-tailed)	Female EPQ E (N=96)	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Female EPQ N (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)	Female EPQ L (N=96)	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men were…)	.021	.842	.127	.216	-.143	.165	-.032	.758
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men acted…)	-.056	.589	-.084	.420	-.033	.753	-.093	.368
Difference male on self – female on male (how men were…)	-.051	.624	-.059	.570	.121	.242	.060	.564
Difference male on self – female on male (how men acted…)	-.006	.957	.041	.689	.050	.628	.003	.981

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.102: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female IIP scores and DRF scores for how men thought women felt and how women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male interpersonal problems	Significance (2-tailed)	Female interpersonal problems	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self- male on female	-.135	.189	.065	.529
Difference female on self- male on female	-.055	.596	-.091	.379
Fisher male on self- female on male	-.055	.591	-.054	.598
Difference male on self- female on male	.090	.383	.191	.063

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.103: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male IIP scores and DRF scores for what women thought men said women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male interpersonal problems	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male on female- male on female	-.180	.080
Difference female on male on female- male on female	-.108	.293

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.104: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male IIP scores and DRF scores for what they thought women said men thought women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male interpersonal problems	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male on female- female on male on female	-.156	.129
Difference male on female on male on female- female on male on female	.058	.573

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.105: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male IIP scores and DRF scores for what women thought men said women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male interpersonal problems	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male on female on male- male on female on male	-.223*	.029
Difference female on male on female on male- male on female on male	-.109	.288

* **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**

** **Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.106: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male IIP scores and DRF scores for how men thought women said women were and acted and how women thought men said men were and acted during the disagreement

Variable	Male interpersonal problems (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men were…)	.061	.553
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men acted…)	.103	.319
Difference male on self – female on male (how men were…)	.092	.374
Difference male on self – female on male (how men acted…)	.112	.276
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women were…)	-.191	.063
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women acted…)	.056	.588
Difference female on self – male on female (how women were…)	.182	.076
Difference female on self – male on female (how women acted…)	-.079	.444

* **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
** **Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.107: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female IIP scores and DRF scores for what women thought men said women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female interpersonal problems	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	-.125	.226
Difference female on male on female-male on female	-.213*	.037

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.108: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female IIP scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men thought women felt and what women thought men said women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female interpersonal problems	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.171	.096
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.167	.103
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.102	.322
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.154	.135

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.109: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female IIP scores and DRF scores for how men thought women said women were and acted during the disagreement

Variable	Female interpersonal problems (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women were...)	.007	.947
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women acted...)	.029	.783
Difference female on self – male on female (how women were...)	.128	.213
Difference female on self – male on female (how women acted...)	.006	.956

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.110: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female ADAS scores and DRF scores for how men thought women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male ADAS	Significance (2-tailed)	Female ADAS	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self- male on female	-.222*	.030	-.206*	.044
Difference female on self- male on female	.146	.155	.118	.250

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.111: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female ADAS scores and DRF scores for how women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male ADAS	Significance (2-tailed)	Female ADAS	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self- female on male	-.067	.517	-.075	.465
Difference male on self- female on male	-.074	.474	-.127	.218

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.112: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female ADAS scores and DRF scores for what men said women thought men felt and what women thought men said women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male ADAS	Significance (2-tailed)	Female ADAS	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male-female on male	.002	.985	.069	.505
Difference male on female on male-female on male	-.049	.637	-.104	.311
Fisher female on male on female-male on female	-.111	.281	-.033	.752
Difference female on male on female-male on female	.060	.563	.082	.425

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.113: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female ADAS scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men thought women felt and what women thought men said women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male ADAS	Significance (2-tailed)	Female ADAS	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male on female- female on male on female	.109	.290	.123	.233
Difference male on female on male on female- female on male on female	-.037	.723	-.079	.441
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.048	.640	-.055	.596
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.011	.915	.085	.409

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.114: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male and female ADAS scores and DRF scores for how men thought women said women were and acted and how women thought men said men were and acted during the disagreement

Variable	Male ADAS	Significance (2-tailed)	Female ADAS	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men were…)	.024	.817	.167	.104
Fisher male on self – female on male (how men acted…)	.117	.260	.187	.069
Difference male on self – female on male (how men were…)	-.085	.408	-.169	.099
Difference male on self – female on male (how men acted…)	-.067	.516	-.136	.186
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women were…)	.004	.971	.048	.640
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women acted…)	.069	.504	.020	.844
Difference female on self – male on female (how women were…)	-.035	.734	-.113	.274
Difference female on self – male on female (how women acted…)	-.040	.698	-.046	.658

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.115: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male GSI scores and DRF scores for how men thought women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self- male on female	-.206*	.044
Difference female on self- male on female	-.071	.491

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.116: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male GSI scores and DRF scores for how women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self- female on male	-.041	.691
Difference male on self- female on male	.147	.153

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.117: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male GSI scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male- female on male	-.065	.529
Difference male on female on male- female on male	.035	.738

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.118: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male GSI scores and DRF scores for what women thought men said women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male on female- male on female	-.222*	.030
Difference female on male on female- male on female	-.054	.604

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.119: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male GSI scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men thought women felt and what women thought men said women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Male GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.111	.281
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.021	.840
Fisher female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.058	.572
Difference female on male on female on male-male on female on male	-.044	.670

* **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
** **Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.120: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male GSI scores and DRF scores for how men thought women said women were and acted during the disagreement

Variable	Male GSI (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women were…)	-.117	.255
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women acted…)	.038	.716
Difference female on self – male on female (how women were…)	.204*	.046
Difference female on self – male on female (how women acted…)	-.026	.798

* **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
** **Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.121: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female GSI scores and DRF scores for how men thought women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self- male on female	-.037	.719
Difference female on self- male on female	-.225*	.027

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.122: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female GSI scores and DRF scores for how women thought men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on self- female on male	.091	.376
Difference male on self- female on male	.211*	.039

***Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.123: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female GSI scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male- female on male	-.093	.366
Difference male on female on male- female on male	.226*	.027

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.124: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female GSI scores and DRF scores for what women thought men said women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on male on female- male on female	-.031	.761
Difference female on male on female- male on female	-.157	.126

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.125: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female GSI scores and DRF scores for what men thought women said men thought women felt during the disagreement

Variable	Female GSI	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher male on female on male on female-female on male on female	-.125	.227
Difference male on female on male on female-female on male on female	.173	.092

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 4.5.126: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female GSI scores and DRF scores for how men thought women said women were and acted during the disagreement

Variable	Female GSI (N =96)	Significance (2-tailed)
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women were…)	-.015	.886
Fisher female on self – male on female (how women acted…)	.018	.863
Difference female on self – male on female (how women were…)	.240*	.019
Difference female on self – male on female (how women acted…)	.119	.246

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Appendix 4.5.4: Standardized factor difference scores as predictors of other variables

Appendix 4.5.4.1: Insignificant models for male standardized factor difference scores as predictors of other variables

Table 4.5.127: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male ADAS scores at time 1 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.042	.773
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.026	.824
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.003	.975
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.333	.024
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.128	.287
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.004	.976
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.109	.361
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.242	.051
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.115	.399
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.032	.818
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.147	.229
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.052	.687

$F = 1.093, p = .377. R^2 = .012.$

Table 4.5.128: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female ADAS scores at time 1 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.087	.552
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.093	.428
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.026	.811
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.279	.060
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.015	.901
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.182	.176
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.102	.396
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.131	.292
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.212	.124
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.072	.603
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.068	.580
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.050	.701

$F = .975, p = .479. R^2 = -.003.$

Table 4.5.129: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male ADAS scores at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.015	.928
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.357	.014
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.150	.230
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.315	.064
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.070	.609
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.275	.081
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.149	.278
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.059	.680
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.239	.124
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.054	.738
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.014	.929
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.027	.859

$F = 1.477, p = .159. R^2 = .075.$

Table 4.5.130: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female ADAS scores at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.039	.815
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.354	.016
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.138	.275
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.358	.038
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.052	.707
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.277	.082
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.165	.233
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.035	.811
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.176	.262
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.069	.674
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.020	.897
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.010	.947

$F = 1.329, p = .227. R^2 = .053.$

Table 4.5.131: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and couple ADAS scores at time 1 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.025	.865
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.064	.584
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.012	.910
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.327	.028
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.060	.620
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.096	.472
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.113	.346
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.199	.110
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.175	.201
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.056	.687
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.115	.350
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.054	.674

$F = 1.024, p = .435. R^2 = .003.$

Table 4.5.132: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and couple ADAS scores at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.177	.450
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.269	.178
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.115	.483
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.457	.059
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.043	.814
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.008	.975
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.234	.204
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.319	.109
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.156	.485
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.044	.865
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.259	.218
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.436	.053

$F = 1.784, p = .110. R^2 = .207.$

Table 4.5.133: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male ECR anxiety as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.100	.495
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.073	.540
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.030	.784
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.001	.996
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.031	.797
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.005	.969
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.145	.231
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.053	.672
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.062	.654
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.240	.087
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.066	.590
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.223	.089

$F = .880, p = .570. R^2 = -.015.$

Table 4.5.134: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male ECR avoidance as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.035	.810
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.134	.261
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.000	.999
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.274	.066
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.088	.469
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.012	.927
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.004	.976
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.126	.314
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.193	.164
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.082	.556
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.060	.627
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.087	.506

$F = .873, p = .577. R^2 = -.016$

Table 4.5.135: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female ECR avoidance as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.180	.205
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.009	.936
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.072	.495
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.159	.266
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.078	.506
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.002	.987
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.001	.993
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.036	.767
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.021	.876
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.096	.476
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.169	.157
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.096	.442

$F = 1.498, p = .142. R^2 = .059.$

Table 4.5.136: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male GSI as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.014	.923
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.150	.190
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.073	.491
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.076	.595
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.172	.143
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.108	.406
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.053	.647
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.056	.638
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.067	.613
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.093	.487
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.051	.666
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.294	.021

$F = 1.506, p = .138. R^2 = .060.$

Table 4.5.137: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male IIP as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.101	.485
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.148	.204
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.072	.507
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.126	.384
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.072	.545
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.178	.179
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.021	.859
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.108	.379
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.179	.188
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.128	.351
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.062	.609
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.034	.789

$F = 1.199, p = .298. R^2 = .025.$

Table 4.5.138: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female IIP as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.057	.701
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.013	.913
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.145	.191
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.223	.134
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.111	.361
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.006	.964
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.109	.365
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.033	.795
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.065	.638
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.118	.399
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.121	.329
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.188	.152

$F = .839, p = .611. R^2 = -.021.$

Table 4.5.139: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male EPQ Psychoticism as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.346	.019
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.001	.992
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.016	.884
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.144	.325
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.034	.775
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.101	.448
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.003	.978
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.055	.655
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.174	.201
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.134	.330
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.132	.280
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.001	.992

$F = 1.096, p = .374. R^2 = .012.$

Table 4.5.140: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male EPQ Extraversion as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.045	.756
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.041	.719
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.005	.964
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.103	.476
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.183	.124
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.080	.543
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.090	.444
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.251	.042
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.170	.208
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.135	.322
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.210	.084
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.107	.400

$F = 1.286, p = .243. R^2 = .035.$

Table 4.5.141: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male EPQ Lying as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.017	.907
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.063	.584
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.105	.330
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.068	.634
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.032	.786
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.057	.663
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.387	.001
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.007	.955
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.018	.892
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.052	.700
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.004	.972
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.052	.680

$F = 1.352, p = .206. R^2 = .043.$

Table 4.5.142: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female EPQ Extraversion as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.027	.852
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.024	.835
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.190	.085
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.059	.690
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.039	.743
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.238	.077
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.136	.256
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.049	.690
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.036	.792
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.217	.119
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.003	.982
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.099	.447

$F = 1.286, p = .243. R^2 = .035.$

Table 4.5.143: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female EPQ Neuroticism as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.031	.827
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.013	.912
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.253	.021
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.015	.918
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.092	.437
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.168	.201
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.067	.569
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.080	.508
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.127	.347
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.045	.741
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.104	.389
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.069	.584

$F = 1.278, p = .247. R^2 = .034.$

Table 4.5.144: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female EPQ Lying as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.074	.592
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.056	.615
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.124	.235
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.184	.188
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.006	.958
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.186	.144
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.053	.643
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.319	.008
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.284	.031
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.287	.031
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.017	.886
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.071	.562

$F = 1.845, p = .054. R^2 = .096.$

Table 4.5.145: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male psychological mindedness as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.016	.909
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.050	.663
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.118	.274
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.116	.423
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.154	.195
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.241	.069
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.114	.335
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.126	.300
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.078	.561
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.036	.792
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.027	.821
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.113	.373

$F = 1.266, p = .254. R^2 = .032.$

Table 4.5.146: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female psychological mindedness as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.064	.665
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.102	.388
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.011	.917
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.087	.556
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.114	.346
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.064	.631
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.138	.250
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.118	.341
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.034	.803
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.284	.043
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.018	.881
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.098	.450

$F = .944, p = .508$. $R^2 = -.007$.

Appendix 4.5.4.2: Insignificant models for female standardized factor difference scores as predictors of other variables

Table 4.5.147: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male ADAS scores at time 1 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.042	.739
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.147	.221
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.103	.399
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.113	.374
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.138	.293
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.058	.654
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.063	.582
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.228	.067
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.195	.141
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.128	.336
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.004	.975
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.198	.130

$F = 1.091, p = .378$. $R^2 = .011$.

Table 4.5.148: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female ADAS scores at time 1 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.026	.837
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.296	.013
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.192	.112
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.100	.421
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.218	.091
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.009	.943
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.029	.793
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.140	.247
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.272	.037
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.138	.289
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.003	.980
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.060	.638

$F = 1.446, p = .162$. $R^2 = .053$.

Table 4.5.149: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male ADAS scores at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.256	.095
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.189	.160
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.045	.749
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.084	.559
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.138	.291
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.429	.006
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.092	.485
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.217	.107
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.212	.133
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.185	.211
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.012	.929
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.046	.755

$F = 1.671, p = .097$. $R^2 = .102$.

Table 4.5.150: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female ADAS scores at time 2 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.235	.128
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.205	.130
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.079	.575
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.069	.633
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.130	.326
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.428	.006
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.053	.692
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.234	.086
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.148	.298
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.168	.259
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.036	.800
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.029	.844

$F = 1.550, p = .132. R^2 = .085.$

Table 4.5.151: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and couple ADAS scores at time 1 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.009	.945
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.238	.047
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.158	.192
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.114	.364
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.191	.141
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.035	.780
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.049	.663
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.197	.109
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.250	.057
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.142	.278
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.004	.976
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.137	.286

$F = 1.311, p = .228. R^2 = .038.$

Table 4.5.152: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male ECR anxiety as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.019	.888
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.033	.794
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.010	.939
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.049	.714
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.022	.872
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.112	.409
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.125	.295
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.115	.378
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.080	.565
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.010	.941
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.034	.790
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.010	.942

$F = .345, p = .978. R^2 = -.090.$

Table 4.5.153: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male ECR avoidance as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.071	.584
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.156	.205
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.055	.661
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.064	.622
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.078	.560
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.112	.396
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.034	.767
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.177	.162
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.060	.657
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.260	.057
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.034	.785
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.182	.172

$F = .765, p = .684. R^2 = -.031.$

Table 4.5.154: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male GSI as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.067	.587
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.203	.084
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.062	.601
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.198	.112
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.143	.262
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.011	.930
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.089	.421
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.209	.083
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.137	.287
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.037	.773
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.073	.529
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.305	.017

$F = 1.577, p = .114. R^2 = .068.$

Table 4.5.155: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female GSI as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.044	.727
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.078	.511
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.166	.171
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.056	.654
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.031	.810
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.031	.805
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.295	.010
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.138	.260
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.188	.150
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.168	.202
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.189	.114
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.115	.369

$F = 1.306, p = .231. R^2 = .037.$

Table 4.5.156: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male IIP as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.021	.872
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.069	.567
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.159	.198
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.050	.694
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.099	.451
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.102	.432
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.160	.163
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.057	.647
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.010	.938
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.173	.196
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.041	.734
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.102	.433

$F = 1.035, p = .426. R^2 = .004.$

Table 4.5.157: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female IIP as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.265	.036
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.101	.391
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.237	.051
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.102	.417
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.080	.533
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.037	.773
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.112	.319
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.015	.903
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.085	.514
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.197	.133
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.183	.125
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.166	.197

$F = 1.336, p = .214. R^2 = .041.$

Table 4.5.158: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male EPQ Psychoticism as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.104	.423
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.178	.150
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.099	.430
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.139	.288
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.107	.424
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.081	.543
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.059	.612
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.042	.740
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.078	.566
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.010	.943
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.018	.883
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.056	.673

$F = .677, p = .768. R^2 = -.042.$

Table 4.5.159: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male EPQ Extraversion as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.068	.597
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.089	.464
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.010	.938
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.268	.040
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.053	.690
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.080	.537
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.066	.566
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.078	.532
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.112	.398
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.096	.472
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.013	.915
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.007	.956

$F = .963, p = .490. R^2 = -.005.$

Table 4.5.160: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male EPQ Neuroticism as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.107	.396
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.104	.380
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.062	.608
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.052	.679
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.044	.731
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.030	.816
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.126	.263
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.182	.139
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.004	.977
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.024	.855
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.100	.399
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.279	.032

$F = 1.259, p = .259. R^2 = .032.$

Table 4.5.161: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male EPQ Lying as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.092	.462
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.021	.858
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.069	.570
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.177	.161
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.022	.867
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.131	.306
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.103	.361
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.045	.710
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.091	.484
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.008	.950
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.198	.099
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.213	.099

$F = 1.294, p = .238. R^2 = .036.$

Table 4.5.162: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female EPQ Psychoticism as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.064	.626
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.068	.580
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.197	.118
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.105	.422
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.194	.150
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.097	.463
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.047	.690
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.003	.981
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.047	.727
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.025	.852
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.020	.873
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.113	.397

$F = .676, p = .769. R^2 = -.043.$

Table 4.5.163: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female EPQ Extraversion as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.141	.276
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.045	.710
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.030	.808
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.145	.264
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.048	.714
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.068	.602
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.178	.125
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.062	.622
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.074	.580
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.190	.160
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.123	.314
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.125	.344

$F = .880, p = .570. R^2 = -.015.$

Table 4.5.164: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female EPQ Neuroticism as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	.048	.706
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.010	.934
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.091	.462
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.036	.781
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.208	.117
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	.008	.953
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	-.152	.189
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.053	.673
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.293	.030
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.171	.203
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.071	.562
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.069	.600

$F = .929, p = .523. R^2 = -.009.$

Table 4.5.165: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female EPQ Lying as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.100	.419
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.135	.251
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.047	.697
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.260	.039
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.198	.124
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.290	.024
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.081	.467
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	-.007	.952
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.173	.180
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	.028	.826
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.027	.815
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.059	.640

$F = 1.458, p = .157. R^2 = .055.$

Table 4.5.166: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and male psychological mindedness as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.163	.202
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	-.100	.406
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	.020	.871
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	.189	.142
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	-.111	.394
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.015	.909
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.052	.651
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.158	.203
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	-.059	.653
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.054	.682
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	-.178	.141
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	-.201	.124

$F = 1.083, p = .385. R^2 = .010.$

Table 4.5.167: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for female DRF standardized factor difference scores as predictor variables and female psychological mindedness as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF1	-.121	.359
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF1	.017	.891
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 1	-.013	.917
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF1	-.068	.607
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF2	.003	.982
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF2	-.106	.430
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 2	.019	.870
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF2	.063	.623
Factor 1 (Avoidant) DRF3	.098	.474
Factor 2 (Optimistic) DRF3	-.003	.980
Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated) DRF 3	.009	.940
Factor 4 (Anxious) DRF3	.205	.129

$F = .555, p = .872. R^2 = -.060.$

Appendix 4.5.4.3: Correlations between factor difference scores and other variables

Female on male vs. Male on self: Factor differences scores with other variables

Table 4.5.168: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for female DRF factor difference scores for female on male vs. male on self and both male and female scores on other variables

	Factor 1 (Avoidant)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 2 (Optimistic)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 4 (Anxious)	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	.046	.654	.059	.566	-.003	.978	.041	.689
Male ECR Avoidance	.037	.720	.099	.339	.086	.403	-.011	.918
Male Psychological Mindedness	-.159	.122	-.134	.194	-.045	.661	.051	.620
Male EPQ Psychoticism	.054	.603	.218*	.033	-.084	.415	-.101	.329
Male EPQ Extraversion	-.008	.935	.132	.198	-.055	.595	-.290**	.004
Male EPQ Neuroticism	-.073	.480	.051	.622	-.056	.585	.089	.386
Male EPQ Lying	-.022	.833	.091	.377	-.127	.218	-.026	.803
Male Interpersonal Problems	.038	.712	.172	.095	.126	.222	-.073	.481
Male Global Severity Index	.100	.333	.166	.106	-.065	.528	-.028	.786
Male ADAS Time 1	.078	.448	-.088	.396	-.059	.570	-.128	.215
Male ADAS Time 2	.188	.113	-.048	.689	.080	.504	.097	.415
Female ECR Anxiety	-.236*	.021	.125	.226	.097	.345	.055	.596
Female ECR Avoidance	-.153	.137	.159	.123	.203*	.048	-.112	.279

Table 4.5.168 (continued): Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for female DRF factor difference scores for female on male vs. male on self and both male and female scores on other variables

Female Psychological Mindedness	-.028	.783	-.054	.604	-.029	.780	.053	.606
Female EPQ Psychoticism	.018	.859	-.058	.575	.182	.076	-.037	.717
Female EPQ Extraversion	-.002	.987	.067	.516	.028	.786	.153	.137
Female EPQ Neuroticism	-.055	.596	.084	.418	-.026	.798	-.038	.715
Female EPQ Lying	.008	.936	.026	.803	-.004	.970	.270**	.008
Female Interpersonal Problems	-.233*	.022	.019	.852	.053	.606	-.113	.272
Female Global Severity Index	-.009	.928	-.019	.853	.024	.816	.076	.459
Female ADAS Time 1	-.010	.921	-.233*	.022	-.164	.110	-.110	.288
Female ADAS Time 2	.199	.093	-.073	.544	.042	.728	.084	.484
Couple ADAS Time 1	.036	.728	-.172	.093	-.120	.245	-.127	.218
Couple ADAS Time 2	.152	.370	-.247	.140	.163	.334	-.129	.447

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Female on male on female vs. Male on female: Factor differences scores with other variables

Table 4.5.169: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for female DRF factor difference scores for female on male on female vs. male on female and both male and female scores on other variables

	Factor 1 (Avoidant)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 2 (Optimistic)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 4 (Anxious)	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	.023	.823	.105	.308	-.098	.342	.102	.325
Male ECR Avoidance	-.003	.980	.052	.617	.000	.999	-.100	.330
Male Psychological Mindedness	-.114	.271	-.074	.476	-.038	.713	.029	.776
Male EPQ Psychoticism	.025	.811	.139	.178	.042	.685	-.065	.530
Male EPQ Extraversion	-.073	.479	.032	.760	-.118	.253	-.158	.125
Male EPQ Neuroticism	.022	.834	-.025	.809	-.082	.428	.206*	.044
Male EPQ Lying	-.084	.414	.130	.208	-.159	.121	-.146	.157
Male Interpersonal Problems	.021	.837	.212*	.038	-.120	.245	.008	.939
Male Global Severity Index	.005	.964	.050	.631	-.061	.552	.191	.062
Male ADAS Time 1	.008	.937	.047	.653	.018	.860	.139	.177
Male ADAS Time 2	-.088	.460	.257*	.029	.020	.868	.239*	.043
Female ECR Anxiety	-.150	.145	.318**	.002	-.027	.792	-.346**	.001
Female ECR Avoidance	-.347**	.001	.284**	.005	-.033	.748	-.242*	.017
Female Psychological Mindedness	.096	.354	-.126	.222	.036	.726	.126	.223

Table 4.5.169 (continued): Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for female DRF factor difference scores for female on male on female vs. male on female and both male and female scores on other variables

Female EPQ Psychoticism	-.170	.097	-.033	.752	-.007	.943	-.026	.804
Female EPQ Extraversion	.090	.381	.020	.846	.196	.056	.091	.377
Female EPQ Neuroticism	.009	.934	.092	.374	-.134	.194	-.087	.400
Female EPQ Lying	-.014	.890	-.210*	.040	.123	.234	.076	.462
Female Interpersonal Problems	-.161	.117	.138	.181	-.157	.126	-.121	.241
Female Global Severity Index	-.018	.862	.025	.805	-.236*	.021	.095	.359
Female ADAS Time 1	-.024	.814	-.048	.646	-.024	.814	.097	.348
Female ADAS Time 2	-.063	.601	.246*	.037	.039	.742	.250*	.034
Couple ADAS Time 1	-.009	.932	-.001	.992	-.004	.973	.126	.221
Couple ADAS Time 2	.130	.443	.246	.143	.133	.431	.217	.196

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Female on male on female on male vs. Male on female on male: Factor differences scores with other variables

Table 4.5.170: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for female DRF factor difference scores for female on male on female on male vs. male on female on male and both male and female scores on other variables

	Factor 1 (Avoidant)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 2 (Optimistic)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 4 (Anxious)	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	.078	.451	.058	.574	-.024	.815	.023	.825
Male ECR Avoidance	-.001	.995	-.120	.244	.070	.497	.105	.307
Male Psychological Mindedness	-.136	.186	-.089	.390	-.161	.116	-.146	.155
Male EPQ Psychoticism	-.031	.768	.150	.144	-.020	.847	-.003	.974
Male EPQ Extraversion	.034	.742	.091	.376	-.101	.330	-.161	.117
Male EPQ Neuroticism	.016	.878	-.026	.803	.155	.132	.281**	.006
Male EPQ Lying	-.126	.221	.111	.280	-.281**	.006	-.232*	.023
Male Interpersonal Problems	.019	.857	.216*	.034	.036	.728	-.112	.276
Male Global Severity Index	.152	.138	.027	.795	-.012	.911	.229*	.025
Male ADAS Time 1	.144	.163	.065	.529	-.048	.639	-.146	.155
Male ADAS Time 2	-.055	.645	-.019	.874	.057	.637	.102	.392
Female ECR Anxiety	-.187	.067	.135	.191	-.111	.282	-.125	.226
Female ECR Avoidance	-.283**	.005	.011	.913	-.014	.891	-.182	.076
Female Psychological Mindedness	.111	.282	-.081	.430	.067	.518	.200	.051
Female EPQ Psychoticism	-.072	.483	-.055	.598	.084	.414	.033	.750

Table 4.5.170 (continued): Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for female DRF factor difference scores for female on male on female on male vs. male on female on male and both male and female scores on other variables

Female EPQ Extraversion	.050	.629	.156	.128	.141	.172	.047	.649
Female EPQ Neuroticism	-.208*	.042	.185	.071	-.079	.443	-.037	.724
Female EPQ Lying	.090	.383	-.060	.558	.074	.471	.199	.052
Female Interpersonal Problems	-.078	.450	.144	.162	-.120	.245	-.018	.859
Female Global Severity Index	-.118	.253	.100	.332	-.126	.221	.047	.646
Female ADAS Time 1	.153	.138	-.009	.934	-.071	.490	-.053	.605
Female ADAS Time 2	-.005	.965	-.015	.898	.026	.826	.100	.405
Couple ADAS Time 1	.158	.123	.030	.773	-.064	.535	-.106	.302
Couple ADAS Time 2	.196	.244	.319	.054	.157	.353	-.190	.259

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Male on female vs. Female on self: Factor differences scores with other variables

Table 4.5.171: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for male DRF factor difference scores for male on female vs. female on self and both male and female scores on other variables

	Factor 1 (Avoidant)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 2 (Optimistic)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 4 (Anxious)	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	-.061	.555	-.095	.357	.022	.828	-.079	.447
Male ECR Avoidance	.082	.425	-.199	.052	.021	.837	.172	.094
Male Psychological Mindedness	.079	.443	.147	.154	-.078	.449	-.056	.590
Male EPQ Psychoticism	-.154	.135	-.093	.366	-.018	.858	.058	.572
Male EPQ Extraversion	-.005	.962	.043	.680	.035	.736	.065	.531
Male EPQ Neuroticism	-.201*	.049	-.050	.629	-.026	.804	-.142	.169
Male EPQ Lying	.077	.457	-.047	.647	-.052	.612	.078	.452
Male Interpersonal Problems	-.020	.850	-.200	.050	.059	.569	-.074	.473
Male Global Severity Index	-.091	.377	-.158	.124	.006	.957	-.165	.108

Table 4.5.171 (continued): Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for male DRF factor difference scores for male on female vs. female on self and both male and female scores on other variables

Male ADAS Time 1	-.051	.624	.046	.659	-.024	.816	-.180	.079
Male ADAS Time 2	.020	.867	-.185	.121	.052	.663	-.163	.172
Female ECR Anxiety	.285**	.005	-.239*	.019	.132	.199	.349**	.000
Female ECR Avoidance	.331**	.001	-.122	.238	.130	.206	.306**	.002
Female Psychological Mindedness	-.097	.348	-.041	.690	-.061	.556	-.025	.810
Female EPQ Psychoticism	.092	.375	.034	.741	.052	.617	.238*	.019
Female EPQ Extraversion	-.093	.369	-.060	.563	-.229*	.025	-.051	.623
Female EPQ Neuroticism	.066	.525	-.055	.597	.275**	.007	.090	.384
Female EPQ Lying	-.025	.805	.075	.470	-.197	.054	-.150	.143
Female Interpersonal Problems	.123	.231	-.030	.775	.147	.152	-.005	.959
Female Global Severity Index	.083	.423	-.099	.337	.260*	.010	.010	.921
Female ADAS Time 1	-.062	.547	.043	.676	-.063	.542	-.153	.137
Female ADAS Time 2	-.022	.857	-.165	.165	.050	.674	-.189	.111
Couple ADAS Time 1	-.060	.558	.048	.646	-.047	.651	-.178	.083
Couple ADAS Time 2	-.178	.292	-.119	.482	.129	.445	-.231	.168

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Male on female on male vs. Female on male: Factor differences scores with other variables

Table 4.5.172: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for male DRF factor difference scores for male on female on male vs. female on male and both male and female scores on other variables

	Factor 1 (Avoidant)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 2 (Optimistic)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 4 (Anxious)	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	-.011	.915	-.096	.352	.078	.452	-.028	.789
Male ECR Avoidance	.083	.419	-.101	.326	-.007	.944	-.070	.499
Male Psychological Mindedness	.153	.137	.250*	.014	.149	.146	.093	.370

Table 4.5.172 (continued): Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for male DRF factor difference scores for male on female on male vs. female on male and both male and female scores on other variables

Male EPQ Psychoticism	-.074	.474	-.184	.072	-.055	.595	.069	.506
Male EPQ Extraversion	-.081	.433	-.035	.734	.025	.808	.237*	.020
Male EPQ Neuroticism	-.036	.731	-.044	.671	-.081	.432	-.297**	.003
Male EPQ Lying	.122	.236	-.071	.494	.376**	.000	.081	.433
Male Interpersonal Problems	-.090	.383	-.239*	.019	-.083	.421	.018	.858
Male Global Severity Index	-.176	.087	-.125	.224	-.016	.881	-.186	.070
Male ADAS Time 1	-.124	.229	.055	.593	.024	.819	.156	.129
Male ADAS Time 2	-.124	.301	.153	.199	.054	.654	-.055	.646
Female ECR Anxiety	.295**	.004	-.203*	.048	.064	.536	.017	.873
Female ECR Avoidance	.196	.056	-.089	.390	.039	.707	.151	.142
Female Psychological Mindedness	.050	.629	.050	.630	-.123	.234	-.145	.160
Female EPQ Psychoticism	.012	.906	.150	.145	-.157	.128	.030	.770
Female EPQ Extraversion	-.068	.508	-.107	.301	-.159	.122	-.129	.211
Female EPQ Neuroticism	.124	.229	-.220*	.031	.017	.872	-.007	.946
Female EPQ Lying	.007	.943	-.031	.764	.017	.871	-.287**	.005
Female Interpersonal Problems	.134	.193	-.094	.362	.088	.391	.061	.557
Female Global Severity Index	.011	.913	.033	.751	.221*	.030	-.039	.704
Female ADAS Time 1	-.019	.852	.197	.055	.054	.598	.085	.412
Female ADAS Time 2	-.118	.322	.143	.232	.070	.560	-.058	.629
Couple ADAS Time 1	-.076	.461	.136	.188	.042	.685	.128	.213
Couple ADAS Time 2	-.132	.438	.012	.943	-.342*	.038	.143	.399

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Male on female on male on female vs. Female on male on female: Factor differences scores with other variables

Table 4.5.173: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for male DRF factor difference scores for male on female on male on female vs. female on male on female and both male and female scores on other variables

	Factor 1 (Avoidant)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 2 (Optimistic)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 3 (Annoyed & Frustrated)	Significance (2-tailed)	Factor 4 (Anxious)	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	-.045	.662	-.174	.089	-.076	.462	-.177	.084
Male ECR Avoidance	-.038	.710	-.098	.341	-.025	.811	-.013	.900
Male Psychological Mindedness	.095	.359	.115	.266	.020	.849	-.123	.231
Male EPQ Psychoticism	.077	.456	-.166	.105	-.112	.277	.067	.514
Male EPQ Extraversion	.119	.247	.046	.653	.182	.075	.202*	.049
Male EPQ Neuroticism	.068	.511	-.071	.495	.031	.761	-.344**	.001
Male EPQ Lying	.095	.355	-.001	.993	.162	.114	.074	.476
Male Interpersonal Problems	-.109	.292	-.223*	.029	-.093	.368	-.008	.941
Male Global Severity Index	-.041	.690	-.140	.173	-.029	.781	-.268**	.008
Male ADAS Time 1	.017	.869	.007	.947	-.155	.132	-.022	.829
Male ADAS Time 2	.152	.203	-.071	.552	-.081	.499	-.119	.321
Female ECR Anxiety	.070	.497	-.239*	.019	.120	.245	.241*	.018
Female ECR Avoidance	.242*	.018	-.200	.051	-.035	.733	.201*	.050
Female Psychological Mindedness	-.078	.450	.228*	.026	-.029	.779	-.135	.191
Female EPQ Psychoticism	.177	.085	-.032	.758	-.157	.127	-.018	.860
Female EPQ Extraversion	-.050	.629	.089	.387	-.072	.483	-.100	.334
Female EPQ Neuroticism	-.030	.770	-.134	.193	.163	.112	.130	.206
Female EPQ Lying	.091	.380	.128	.215	.059	.570	-.078	.450
Female Interpersonal Problems	.118	.251	-.180	.080	-.005	.961	.136	.187

Table 4.5.173 (continued): Spearman's Rho correlation coefficients for male DRF factor difference scores for male on female on male on female vs. female on male on female and both male and female scores on other variables

Female Global Severity Index	.159	.122	-.005	.959	-.037	.721	-.159	.121
Female ADAS Time 1	.069	.502	.118	.252	-.078	.452	-.054	.602
Female ADAS Time 2	.100	.403	-.059	.621	-.053	.657	-.097	.417
Couple ADAS Time 1	.047	.653	.067	.514	-.124	.229	-.041	.692
Couple ADAS Time 2	-.261	.119	-.013	.939	-.311	.061	.104	.542

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Appendix 4.5.5: Differences between men and women on standardized factor difference scores

Table 4.5.174: Wilcoxon Z scores for male and female DRF factor difference scores

Male & Female respective Factor Difference Scores	Wilcoxon's Z	Significance (2-tailed)
Male & Female DRF 1	-.139 a	.890
Male & Female DRF 1	-.066 a	.948
Male & Female DRF 1	-.164 b	.869
Male & Female DRF 1	-.205 b	.838
Male & Female DRF 2	-.026 a	.980
Male & Female DRF 2	-.110 b	.913
Male & Female DRF 2	-.252 b	.801
Male & Female DRF 2	-.080 b	.936
Male & Female DRF 3	-.084 a	.933
Male & Female DRF 3	-.029 a	.977
Male & Female DRF 3	-.431 a	.666
Male & Female DRF 3	-.362 b	.718

a. Based on positive ranks
b. Based on negative ranks
c. Wilcoxon signed ranks test

Appendix 4.5.6: DRF projection scores

Appendix 4.5.6.1: Correlations between male DRF projection scores and male and female variables

Table 4.5.175: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male DRF projection scores and both male and female scores on other variables

	Male Projection Score 1	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Projection Score 2	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Projection Score 3	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	-.015	.884	.013	.903	-.148	.152
Male ECR Avoidance	-.011	.918	.040	.696	-.136	.186
Male Psychological Mindedness	.042	.683	.128	.214	.132	.199
Male EPQ Psychoticism	.119	.249	.160	.120	.034	.741
Male EPQ Extraversion	-.026	.801	-.034	.740	.124	.228
Male EPQ Neuroticism	.021	.839	-.031	.768	-.058	.576
Male EPQ Lying	.031	.764	-.067	.515	-.087	.397
Male Interpersonal Problems	-.093	.369	-.098	.341	-.324**	.001
Male Global Severity Index	-.116	.259	-.059	.570	-.214*	.036
Male ADAS Time 1	.059	.565	.101	.326	.193	.059
Male ADAS Time 2	.142	.233	.068	.571	.050	.676
Female ECR Anxiety	-.135	.190	-.173	.092	-.201*	.050
Female ECR Avoidance	.080	.441	-.094	.361	-.125	.226
Female Psychological Mindedness	.091	.380	.186	.070	-.100	.333
Female EPQ Psychoticism	.099	.339	.056	.588	.122	.236

Table 4.5.175 (continued): Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male DRF projection scores and both male and female scores on other variables

Female EPQ Extraversion	.194	.059	.192	.060	.111	.282
Female EPQ Neuroticism	-.161	.116	-.222*	.030	-.294**	.004
Female EPQ Lying	-.110	.285	-.074	.471	-.021	.842
Female Interpersonal Problems	-.081	.430	-.170	.098	-.101	.326
Female Global Severity Index	-.172	.093	.041	.694	.070	.500
Female ADAS Time 1	.101	.325	.156	.129	.307**	.002
Female ADAS Time 2	.136	.253	.075	.531	.061	.614
Couple ADAS Time 1	.086	.403	.138	.180	.268**	.008
Couple ADAS Time 2	.382*	.020	.282	.091	.221	.089

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Appendix 4.5.6.2: Correlations between female DRF projection scores and male and female variables

Table 4.5.176: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female DRF projection scores and both male and female scores on other variables

	Female Projection Score 1	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Projection Score 2	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Projection Score 3	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	-.124	.229	-.253*	.013	.060	.561
Male ECR Avoidance	-.177	.084	-.339**	.001	-.101	.330
Male Psychological Mindedness	.074	.477	.232*	.023	.134	.194
Male EPQ Psychoticism	-.008	.937	-.115	.266	-.047	.646
Male EPQ Extraversion	-.077	.454	.011	.918	-.054	.599
Male EPQ Neuroticism	.045	.666	.020	.845	.005	.962
Male EPQ Lying	-.072	.488	-.160	.120	-.160	.120
Male Interpersonal Problems	-.187	.068	-.190	.064	-.052	.617

Table 4.5.176 (continued): Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female DRF projection scores and both male and female scores on other variables

Male Global Severity Index	-.145	.159	-.134	.192	-.124	.227
Male ADAS Time 1	.223*	.029	.223	.098	.117	.257
Male ADAS Time 2	.319**	.006	.280*	.017	.179	.133
Female ECR Anxiety	-.333**	.001	-.189	.064	-.211*	.039
Female ECR Avoidance	-.298**	.003	-.344**	.001	-.037	.717
Female Psychological Mindedness	.047	.650	.156	.129	.050	.626
Female EPQ Psychoticism	-.074	.475	-.263**	.010	.002	.984
Female EPQ Extraversion	.089	.391	-.083	.420	.086	.405
Female EPQ Neuroticism	-.353**	.000	-.140	.174	-.330**	.001
Female EPQ Lying	.102	.323	.140	.173	.086	.406
Female Interpersonal Problems	-.416**	.000	-.152	.140	-.355**	.000
Female Global Severity Index	-.103	.317	.031	.763	-.058	.575
Female ADAS Time 1	.297**	.003	.286**	.005	.235*	.021
Female ADAS Time 2	.354**	.002	.262*	.026	.180	.131
Couple ADAS Time 1	.279**	.006	.245*	.016	.189	.066
Couple ADAS Time 2	.288	.084	.113	.507	.302	.069

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Appendix 4.5.7: DRF accuracy scores and DRF projection scores

Appendix 4.5.7.1: Correlations between DRF accuracy scores and DRF projection scores

Table 4.5.177: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male DRF projection scores and male and DRF scores

	Male Projection Score 1	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Projection Score 2	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Projection Score 3	Significance (2-tailed)
Male DRF 1	.205*	.045	.149	.148	.084	.417
Male DRF 2	.216*	.035	.296**	.003	.140	.175
Male DRF 3	.096	.353	.213*	.037	.167	.104
Male DRF 4	.114	.270	.055	.594	.188	.066
Male DRF 5	.097	.351	.135	.192	.036	.728

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.178: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female DRF projection scores and male DRF scores

	Female Projection Score 1	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Projection Score 2	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Projection Score 3	Significance (2-tailed)
Male DRF 1	-.050	.626	.255*	.012	-.079	.446
Male DRF 2	.321**	.001	.101	.328	.126	.220
Male DRF 3	.158	.125	.233*	.023	.007	.949
Male DRF 4	-.020	.849	.297**	.003	-.147	.152
Male DRF 5	-.029	.784	.268**	.009	-.025	.807

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.179: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male DRF projection scores and female and DRF scores

	Male Projection Score 1	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Projection Score 2	Significance (2-tailed)	Male Projection Score 3	Significance (2-tailed)
Female DRF 1	.100	.330	.128	.215	.009	.931
Female DRF 2	.069	.505	-.012	.906	.158	.124
Female DRF 3	.234*	.022	.270**	.008	.162	.114
Female DRF 4	.117	.255	.223*	.029	.154	.134
Female DRF 5	.194	.060	.346**	.001	.142	.170

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

Table 4.5.180: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female DRF projection scores and female DRF scores

	Female Projection Score 1	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Projection Score 2	Significance (2-tailed)	Female Projection Score 3	Significance (2-tailed)
Female DRF 1	.165	.107	.134	.193	.029	.779
Female DRF 2	-.068	.512	.327**	.001	-.206*	.044
Female DRF 3	.285**	.005	.089	.386	.198	.053
Female DRF 4	.084	.417	.183	.075	.275**	.007
Female DRF 5	.214*	.037	.234*	.023	.097	.351

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

4.5.8 *Insignificant models for regression analyses predicting male and female DRF scores from male and female projection scores*

Insignificant models predicting male DRF scores from male and female projection scores

Table 4.5.181: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male and female projection scores as predictor variables and male DRF 3 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Male Projection Score 1	-.017	.895
Male Projection Score 2	.179	.141
Male Projection Score 3	.098	.392
Female Projection Score 1	.104	.446
Female Projection Score 2	.188	.093
Female Projection Score 3	-.160	.223

$F = 1.869, p = .095. R^2 = .052.$

Table 4.5.182: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male and female projection scores s as predictor variables and male DRF 5 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Male Projection Score 1	.094	.451
Male Projection Score 2	.138	.251
Male Projection Score 3	-.047	.681
Female Projection Score 1	-.210	.126
Female Projection Score 2	.342	.003
Female Projection Score 3	-.031	.810

$F = 2.086, p = .063. R^2 = .065.$

Insignificant models predicting female DRF scores from male and female projection scores

Table 4.5.183: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male and female projection scores s as predictor variables and female DRF 1 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Male Projection Score 1	.089	.496
Male Projection Score 2	.093	.453
Male Projection Score 3	-.082	.487
Female Projection Score 1	.180	.203
Female Projection Score 2	.076	.506
Female Projection Score 3	-.137	.312

$F = .882, p = .512. R^2 = -.008$

Table 4.5.184: Standardized Beta coefficients and their respective p-values for male and female projection scores s as predictor variables and female DRF 3 as the criterion variable

Predictor Variable	Beta	P
Male Projection Score 1	.096	.447
Male Projection Score 2	.154	.199
Male Projection Score 3	.020	.863
Female Projection Score 1	.236	.084
Female Projection Score 2	-.032	.774
Female Projection Score 3	-.025	.846

$F = 2.150, p = .055. R^2 = .068.$

Appendix 4.5.9: Differences between men and women on DRF projection scores

Table 4.5.185: Wilcoxon Z scores for male and female DRF projection scores

Male & Female respective DRF projection scores	Wilcoxon's Z	Significance (2-tailed)
Male & Female Projection Score 1	-.201 a	.841
Male & Female Projection Score 2	-1.633 a	.102
Male & Female Projection Score 3	-1.049 b	.294

a. Based on positive ranks
b. Based on negative ranks
c. Wilcoxon signed ranks test

Appendix 5.0: Predictive validity study

Appendix 5.1: DRFQ and relationship status

Table 5.1: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for relationship status at time 2 and both male and female scores on other variables

	Relationship Status	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	-.033	.782
Male ECR Avoidance	-.186	.117
Male Psychological Mindedness	.182	.127
Male EPQ Psychoticism	-.160	.180
Male EPQ Extraversion	.082	.492
Male EPQ Neuroticism	.111	.355
Male EPQ Lying	.169	.157
Male Interpersonal Problems	-.097	.419
Male Global Severity Index	-.029	.808
Female ECR Anxiety	-.279*	.018
Female ECR Avoidance	-.153	.198
Female Psychological Mindedness	-.080	.503
Female EPQ Psychoticism	.087	.465
Female EPQ Extraversion	-.069	.562
Female EPQ Neuroticism	-.089	.456
Female EPQ Lying	.043	.719
Female Interpersonal Problems	-.058	.631
Female Global Severity Index	.060	.617

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Table 5.2: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for relationship status at time 2 and both male and female scores on demographic variables

	Relationship Status	Significance (2-tailed)
Male Age	.171	.150
Male Religiousness	.185	.223
Male Marital Status	.080	.506
How long together	.161	.180
Male Parents' Marital Satisfaction	.152	.331
Male Children	.180	.130
Male Therapy	-.074	.538
Male Happiness of Relationship Compared to Friends'	.090	.554
Male IQ	-.129	.405
Male Ethnicity	.218	.066
Male Education	.155	.197
Female Age	.172	.148
Female Religiousness	-.025	.856
Female Marital Status	.080	.506
Female Parents' Marital Satisfaction	-.062	.658
Female Children	.118	.325
Female Therapy	-.105	.379
Female Happiness of Relationship Compared to Friends'	-.099	.476
Female IQ	-.303*	.026
Female Ethnicity	.205	.084
Female Education	-.044	.716

Table 5.3: Logistic regression analyses predicting relationship status from male DRF projection scores (block 1) and male DRF accuracy scores (block 2)

Predictor	*B*	Wald	*P*	Odds Ratio
Block 1				
M1vsM2	-.170	.034	.854	.844
M1vsM3	-.611	.461	.497	.543
M4vsM5	.797	.695	.405	2.218
Block 2				
M1vsM2	.000	.000	1.000	1.000
M1vsM3	-.702	.483	.487	.495
M4vsM5	.774	.567	.451	2.168
Male DRF 1	-1.160	.856	.355	.314
Male DRF 2	.205	.057	.811	1.227
Male DRF 3	-.193	.033	.857	.825
Male DRF 4	-.467	.273	.601	.627
Male DRF 5	.046	.003	.956	1.047

Table 5.4: Logistic regression analyses predicting relationship status from female DRF projection scores (block 1) and female DRF accuracy scores (block 2)

Predictor	*B*	Wald	*P*	Odds Ratio
Block 1				
F1vsF2	-.211	.044	.834	.810
F1vsF3	.857	1.284	.257	2.357
F4vsF5	.804	.681	.409	2.234
Block 2				
F1vsF2	.078	.005	.946	1.081
F1vsF3	1.288	2.090	.148	3.626
F4vsF5	.133	.014	.905	1.142
Female DRF 1	-.891	.544	.461	.410
Female DRF 2	-1.673	2.162	.141	.188
Female DRF 3	.518	.303	.582	1.679
Female DRF 4	.661	.477	.490	1.936
Female DRF 5	-1.075	.776	.378	.341

Table 5.5: Logistic regression analyses predicting relationship status from male and female DRF projection scores (block 1) and male and female DRF accuracy scores (block 2)

Predictor	*B*	Wald	*P*	Odds Ratio
Block 1				
M1vsM2	-.401	.184	.668	.670
M1vsM3	-.899	.857	.355	.407
M4vsM5	.615	.422	.516	1.849
F1vsF2	-.026	.001	.980	.974
F1vsF3	.795	1.106	.293	2.214
F4vsF5	.956	.873	.350	2.601
Block 2				
M1vsM2	-.075	.005	.943	.928
M1vsM3	-.928	.584	.445	.395
M4vsM5	.696	.440	.507	2.005
F1vsF2	-.039	.001	.977	.962
F1vsF3	2.113	3.499	.061	8.274
F4vsF5	-.173	.018	.894	.841
Male DRF 1	-.802	.300	.584	.448
Male DRF 2	.660	.170	.680	1.936
Male DRF 3	-1.371	.706	.401	.254
Male DRF 4	-1.516	1.266	.260	.220
Male DRF 5	-.588	.311	.577	.555
Female DRF 1	-1.255	.668	.414	.285
Female DRF 2	-.765	.274	.601	.465
Female DRF 3	.704	.395	.530	.2021
Female DRF 4	1.166	1.016	.313	3.210
Female DRF 5	-1.073	.572	.450	.342

Appendix 5.2: DRFQ and male ADAS at time 2

Male ADAS at time 2 and other variables

Table 5.6: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male ADAS scores at time 2 and both male and female scores on other variables

	Male ADAS time 2	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	**-.420****	**.010**
Male ECR Avoidance	**-.584****	**.000**
Male Psychological Mindedness	**.130**	**.442**
Male EPQ Psychoticism	**-.109**	**.521**
Male EPQ Extraversion	**.099**	**.559**
Male EPQ Neuroticism	**-.206**	**.221**
Male EPQ Lying	**-.182**	**.280**
Male Interpersonal Problems	**-.193**	**.253**
Male Global Severity Index	**-.231**	**.169**
Female ECR Anxiety	**-.133**	**.432**
Female ECR Avoidance	**-.111**	**.515**
Female Psychological Mindedness	**-.144**	**.394**
Female EPQ Psychoticism	**.038**	**.823**
Female EPQ Extraversion	**.126**	**.457**
Female EPQ Neuroticism	**.145**	**.391**
Female EPQ Lying	**-.048**	**.780**
Female Interpersonal Problems	**.034**	**.844**
Female Global Severity Index	**-.066**	**.696**

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Male ADAS at time 2 and demographic variables

Table 5.7: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for male ADAS scores at time 2 and both male and female scores on demographic variables

	Male ADAS time 2	Significance (2-tailed)
Male Age	-.222	.187
Male Religiousness	.279	.262
Couple Marital Status	.055	.745
How long together	-.082	.633
Male Parents' Marital Satisfaction	.180	.475
Male Children	-.191	.258
Male Therapy	-.163	.336
Male Happiness of Relationship Compared to Friends'	.685**	.002
Male IQ	.165	.527
Male Ethnicity	-.175	.299
Male Education	-.142	.402
Female Age	-.242	.149
Female Religiousness	-.256	.227
Female Marital Status	.055	.745
Female How Long Together	-.045	.790
Female Parents' Marital Satisfaction	-.066	.759
Female Children	-.208	.217
Female Therapy	-.208	.217
Female Happiness of Relationship Compared to Friends'	.044	.839
Female IQ	-.094	.663
Female Ethnicity	-.294	.078
Female Education	-.051	.766

Appendix 5.3: DRFQ and female ADAS at time 2

Female ADAS at time 2 and other variables

Table 5.8: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female ADAS scores at time 2 and both male and female scores on other variables

	Female ADAS time 2	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	**-.380***	**.020**
Male ECR Avoidance	**-.430****	**.008**
Male Psychological Mindedness	**.046**	**.785**
Male EPQ Psychoticism	**-.091**	**.592**
Male EPQ Extraversion	**.176**	**.298**
Male EPQ Neuroticism	**-.325***	**.049**
Male EPQ Lying	**-.090**	**.595**
Male Interpersonal Problems	**-.287**	**.085**
Male Global Severity Index	**-.340***	**.040**
Female ECR Anxiety	**-.053**	**.754**
Female ECR Avoidance	**-.211**	**.211**
Female Psychological Mindedness	**-.043**	**.802**
Female EPQ Psychoticism	**-.040**	**.812**
Female EPQ Extraversion	**-.030**	**.861**
Female EPQ Neuroticism	**.068**	**.687**
Female EPQ Lying	**-.055**	**.747**
Female Interpersonal Problems	**-.042**	**.803**
Female Global Severity Index	**-.264**	**.114**

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Female ADAS at time 2 and other variables

Table 5.9: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for female ADAS scores at time 2 and both male and female scores on demographic variables

	Female ADAS time 2	Significance (2-tailed)
Male Age	-.441**	.006
Male Religiousness	.094	.711
Male Marital Status	.106	.530
How long together	-.241	.157
Male Parents' Marital Satisfaction	.183	.467
Male Children	-.312	.060
Male Therapy	-.305	.066
Male Happiness of Relationship Compared to Friends'	.718**	.001
Male IQ	.356	.160
Male Ethnicity	-.113	.505
Male Education	-.156	.357
Female Age	-.295	.076
Female Religiousness	-.405*	.049
Female Marital Status	.106	.530
Female How long together	-.207	.220
Female Parents' Marital Satisfaction	.024	.910
Female Children	-.338*	.041
Female Therapy	-.359*	.029
Female Happiness of Relationship Compared to Friends'	.218	.305
Female IQ	-.045	.835
Female Ethnicity	-.057	.737
Female Education	-.110	.517

Appendix 5.4: DRFQ and couple ADAS at time 2

Couple ADAS at time 2 and other variables

Table 5.10: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for couple ADAS scores at time 2 and both male and female scores on other variables

	Couple ADAS time 2	Significance (2-tailed)
Male ECR Anxiety	**-.423****	**.009**
Male ECR Avoidance	**-.530****	**.001**
Male Psychological Mindedness	**.089**	**.599**
Male EPQ Psychoticism	**-.105**	**.536**
Male EPQ Extraversion	**.150**	**.375**
Male EPQ Neuroticism	**-.288**	**.084**
Male EPQ Lying	**-.140**	**.409**
Male Interpersonal Problems	**-.260**	**.121**
Male Global Severity Index	**-.309**	**.063**
Female ECR Anxiety	**-.095**	**.577**
Female ECR Avoidance	**-.176**	**.298**
Female Psychological Mindedness	**-.094**	**.581**
Female EPQ Psychoticism	**-.005**	**.974**
Female EPQ Extraversion	**.043**	**.801**
Female EPQ Neuroticism	**.109**	**.520**
Female EPQ Lying	**-.055**	**.748**
Female Interpersonal Problems	**-.009**	**.959**
Female Global Severity Index	**-.186**	**.271**

*** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed)**
**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)**

Couple ADAS at time 2 and demographic variables

Table 5.11: Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient for combined couple ADAS scores at time 2 and both male and female scores on demographic variables

	Couple ADAS time 2	Significance (2-tailed)
Male Age	**-.363***	**.027**
Male Religiousness	**.181**	**.472**
Male Marital Status	**.089**	**.602**
How long together	**-.180**	**.293**
Male Parents' Marital Satisfaction	**.189**	**.453**
Male Children	**-.273**	**.102**
Male Therapy	**-.256**	**.127**
Male Happiness of Relationship Compared to Friends'	**.731****	**.001**
Male IQ	**.284**	**.270**
Male Ethnicity	**-.150**	**.376**
Male Education	**-.159**	**.348**
Female Age	**-.288**	**.084**
Female Religiousness	**-.358**	**.086**
Female Marital Status	**.089**	**.602**
Female Parents' Marital Satisfaction	**-.017**	**.937**
Female Children	**-.296**	**.075**
Female Therapy	**-.309**	**.063**
Female Happiness of Relationship Compared to Friends'	**.148**	**.489**
Female IQ	**-.071**	**.743**
Female Ethnicity	**-.174**	**.304**
Female Education	**-.088**	**.603**

References

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Water, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the Strange Situation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Alden, L. E., Wiggins, J. S., & Pincus, A. L. (1990). Construction of circumplex scales for the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 55*(3&4), 521-536.

Alexopoulos, D. S., & Kalaitzidis, I. (2004). Psychometric properties of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised (EPQ-R) Short Scale in Greece. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 1205-1220.

Aluja, A., Garcia, O., & Garcia, L. F. (2002a). A comparative study of Zuckerman's three structural models for personality through the NEO-PI-R, ZKPQ-III-Q, EPQ-RS and Goldberg's 50-bipolar adjectives. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33*, 713-725.

Aluja, A., Garcia, O., & Garcia, L. F. (2002b, July). *Analysis of the dimensionality of the EPQ-RS.* Paper presented at the Poster session presented at the 11th European Conference on Personality, Jena, Germany.

Anastasi, A. (1982). *Psychological Testing* (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Applebaum, S. S. (1973). Psychological mindedness: word, concept and essence. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 54*(35-46).

Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16*, 427-454.

Auerbach, J. S., & Blatt, S. J. (1996). Self-representation in severe psychopathology: the role of reflexive self-awareness. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 13*, 297-341.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 226-244.

Beach, S. R. H., Fincham, F. D., & Katz, J. (1998). Marital therapy in the treatment of depression: toward a third generation of outcome research. *Clinical Psychology Review*(In press).

Beitel, M., & Cecero, J. (2003). Predicting psychological mindedness from personality style and attachment security. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 59*, 163-172.

Beitel, M., Ferrer, E., & Cecero, J. (2004). Psychological mindedness and cognitive style. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 60*, 567-582.

Bion, W. (1962a). *Learning from Experience*. London: Heinemann.

Bion, W. (1962b). A theory of thinking. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 43*, 306-310.

Bion, W. (1967). *Differentiation of the Psychotic from the Non-Psychotic Personalities; 'A Theory of Thinking' in Second Thoughts*. London: Karnac Books.

Bonferroni, C. E. (1935). Il calcolo delle assicurazioni su gruppi di teste. *Studi in Onore del Professore Salvatore Ortu Carboni, Rome: Italy*, 13-60.

Bonferroni, C. E. (1936). Teoria statistica delle classi e calcolo delle probabilita. *Pubblicazioni del R Istituto Superiore di Scienze Economiche e Commerciali di Firenze, 8*, 3-62.

Boulet, J., & Boss, M. (1991). Reliability and Validity of the Brief Symptom Inventory. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 3*(3), 433-437.

Bouthillier, D., Julien, D., Dube, M., Belanger, I., & Hamelin, M. (2002). Predictive validity of adult attachment measures in relation to emotion regulation behaviours in marital interactions. *Journal of Adult Development, 9*(4), 291-305.

Bowlby, J. (1979). *The Making and Breaking of Affectional Bonds*. London: Tavistock.

Bradbury, T. N., & Fincham, F. D. (1992). Attributions and behaviour in marital interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 613-628.

Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult romantic attachment: An integrative overview. In J. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford Press.

Brody, G. H., Stoneman, Z., & McCoy, J. K. (1994). Forecasting sibling relationships in early adolescence from child temperaments and family processes in middle childhood. *Child Development, 65*, 771-784.

Bryman, A. (2001). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bucci, W. (1997). *Psychoanalysis and Cognitive Science*. New York: Guilford.

Burman, B., John, R. S., & Margolin, G. (1992). Observed patterns of conflict in violent, non-violent, and non-distressed couples. *Behavioural Assessments, 14*, 15-37.

Burman, B., & Margolin, G. (1992). Analysis of the association between marital relationships and health problems: an interactional perspective. *Psychology Bulletin, 112*, 39-63.

Britton, R. (1989) The missing link: Parental sexuality in the Oedipus Complex. In *The Oedipus Complex Today*, ed. J. Steiner. London: Karnac, pp. 83-101.

Conte, H. R., Buckley, P., Picard, S., & Karasu, T. B. (1995). Relationships between psychological mindedness and personality traits and ego functioning: Validity studies. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 36*(1), 11-17.

Conte, H. R., Plutchik, R., Jung, B. B., & Picard, S. (1990). Psychological mindedness as a predictor of psychotherapy outcome: A preliminary report. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 31*, 426-431.

Conte, H. R., Ratto, R., & Karasu, T. B. (1996). The psychological mindedness scale: Factor structure and relationship to outcome of psychotherapy. *Journal of Psychotherapy Practice and Research, 5*, 250-259.

Corcoran, K., & Mallinckrodt, B. (2000). Adult attachment, self-efficacy, perspective taking, and conflict resolution. *Journal of Counselling and Development, 78*(4), 473-?

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional manual.* Unpublished manuscript, Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Cox, M. J., & Paley, B. (1997). Families as systems. *Annual Review of Psychology, 48*, 243-267.

Coyne, J. C., & Downey, G. (1991). Social factors and psychopathology: stress, social support, and coping processes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 42*, 401-425.

Craik, K. (1943). *The Nature of Exploration.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Creasey, G. (2002). Associations between working models of attachment and conflict management behaviour in romantic couples. *Journal of Counselling Psychology, 49*(3), 365-375.

Creasey, G., & Hesson-McInnis, M. (2001). Affective responses, cognitive appraisals, and conflict tactics in late adolescent romantic relationships: Associations with attachment orientations. *Journal of Counselling Psychology, 48*(1), 85-96.

Cronbach, L. J. (1949). Statistical methods applied to Rorschach scores: A review. *Psychological Bulletin, 46*, 393-429.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334.

Crowell, J. A., Treboux, D., Gao, Y., Fyffe, C., Waters, E., & Pan, H. (2002). Assessing Secure Base Behaviour in Adulthood: Development of a Measure, Links to Adult Attachment Representations, and Relations to Couples' Communication and Reports of Relationships. *Developmental Psychology, 38*(5), 679-693.

Clulow, C. & Mattinson, J. (1989) *Marriage Inside Out.* London: Penguin.

Colman, W. (1993) Marriage as a psychological container. In Ruszczynski, S. (ed) *Psychotherapy With Couples.* London: Karnac.

Davila, J., & Bradbury, T. N. (1998). Psychopathology and the marital dyad. In L. L'Abate (Ed.), *Handbook of Family Psychopathology*. New York: Guilford.

Dennett, D. C. (1978). *Brainstorms: Philosophical essays on mind and psychology*. Montgomery, VT: Bradford.

Derogatis, L. R. (1975). Brief Symptom Inventory. *Clinical Psychometric Research: Baltimore*.

Derogatis, L. R., & Melisaratos, N. (1983). The Brief Symptom Inventory: an introductory report. *Psychological Medicine, 13*(3), 595-605.

Derogatis, L. R., Yevzeroff, H., & Wittelsberger, B. (1975). Social class, psychological disorder and the nature of the psychopathologic indicator. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*, 183-191.

Dixon-Woods, M., Agarwal, S., Young, B., Jones, D., & Sutton, A. (2004). *Integrative approaches to qualitative and quantitative evidence*. London: Health Development Agency.

Duffy, M. E. (1987). Methodological triangulation: a vehicle for merging quantitative and qualitative research methods. *IMAGE, Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 19*, 130-133.

Dunn, J., & Brown, J. (1993). Early conversations about causality: Content, pragmatics, and developmental change. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 11*, 107-123.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). The repertoire of nonverbal behaviour: Categories, origins, usage, and coding. *Semiotics, 1*, 49-98.

Erel, O., & Burman, B. (1995). Interrelatedness of marital relations and parent-child relations: a meta-analytic review. *Psychology Bulletin, 118*, 108-132.

Ewart, C. K., Taylor, C. B., Kraemer, H. C., & Agras, W. S. (1991). High blood pressure and marital discord: not being nasty matters more than being nice. *Health Psychology, 103*, 155-163.

Eysenck, H. J. (1952). *The scientific study of personality*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Eysenck, H. J. (1959). *The Manual of the Maudsley Personality Inventory*. London: University of London Press.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1964). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Inventory*. London: University of London Press.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Junior and Adult)*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales (EPS Adult)*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Fincham, F. D. (1998). Child development and marital relations. *Child Development, 69*, 543-574.

Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (1999). Conflict in Marriage: Implications for Working with Couples. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 47-77.

Fisher, J., & Crandell, L. (2001). Patterns of relating in the couple. In C. Clulow (Ed.), *Adult Attachment and Couple Psychotherapy: A 'secure base' in practice and research* (pp. 15-27). East Sussex: Brunner-Routledge.

Fishtein, J., Pietromonaco, P., & Barrett, L. (1999). The contribution of attachment style and relationship conflict to the complexity of relationship knowledge. *Social Cognition, 17*(2), 228-244.

Fitzpatrick, M., Fey, J., Segrin, C., & Schiff, J. (1993). Internal working models of relationships and marital communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 12*(1-2), 103-131.

Fonagy, P. (1999). Psychoanalysis and attachment theory. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 595-624). New York: Guilford.

Fonagy, P. (2001). *Attachment Theory and Psychoanalysis*. New York: Other Press.

Fonagy, P., Steele, H., & Steele, M. (1991a). Maternal representations of attachment during pregnancy predict infant-mother attachment patterns at one year. *Child Development, 62*, 891-905.

Fonagy, P., Steele, M., Steele, H., Higgitt, A. C., & Target, M. (1994). Theory and practice of resilience. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 35*, 231-257.

Fonagy, P., Steele, M., Steele, H., & Target, M. (1998). *Reflective Functioning Manual, version 5, for application to Adult Attachment Interviews.* Unpublished manuscript, University College, London.

Fonagy, P., & Target, M. (1996). Playing with reality: Theory of mind and the normal development of psychic reality. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 76*, 487-502.

Fonagy, P., & Target, M. (1997). Attachment and reflective function: Their role in self-organization. *Development and Psychopathology, 9*, 679-700.

Fraley, C. R., Brennan, K. A., & Waller, N. G. (2000). An Item Response Theory Analysis of Self-Report Measures of Adult Attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(2), 350-365.

Fisher, J. (1993) The impenetrable other: Ambivalence and the Oedipal conflict in work with couples. In Ruszczynski, S. (ed) *Psychotherapy With Couples*. London: Karnac.

Francis, L. J., Brown, L. B., & Philipchalk, R. (1992). The development of an abbreviated form of the Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-A): Its use among students in England, the U.S.A., and Canada. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13*, 443-449.

Francis, L. J., Lewis, C. A., & Ziebertz, H. G. (2002). *The Short-Form Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-S): A German edition [Abstract].* Paper presented at the British Psychological Society, London.

Francis, L. J., & Pearson, P. R. (1988). Religiosity and the short scale EPQ-R indices of E, N, and L, compared with the JEPI, JEPQ and EPQ. *Personality and Individual Differences, 9*, 653-657.

Freud, S. (1911). Formulations on the two principles of mental functioning. In (Standard ed., Vol. 12, pp. 213-226).

Gaines, J. S., Reis, H., Summers, S., Rusbult, C., Cox, C., Wexler, M., et al. (1997). Impact of attachment style on reactions to accommodative dilemmas in close relationships. *Personal Relationships, 4*(2), 93-113.

Gallo, L., & Smith, T. (2001). Attachment style in marriage: Adjustment and responses to interaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18*, 263-289.

George, C., Kaplan, N., & Main, M. (1985). *The adult attachment interview.* Unpublished manuscript, University of California at Berkeley.

Gerson, M. J. (1989). Tomorrow's fathers: the anticipation of fatherhood. In S. H. Cath, A. Gurwitt & L. Gunsberg (Eds.), *Fathers and their families* (pp. 127-144). London: Analytic Press.

Gesn, P. R., & Ickes, W. (1999). The Development of Meaning Contexts for Empathic Accuracy: Channel and Sequence Effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(4), 746-761.

Gottman, J. M. (1979). *Marital Interaction: Experimental Investigations.* New York: Academic.

Gottman, J. M. (1994). *What Predicts Divorce?* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gottman, J. M., & Levinson, R. W. (1992). Marital processes predictive of later dissolution: behaviour, physiology, and health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 221-233.

Gottman, J. M., & Porterfield, A. (1981). Communicative competence in the nonverbal behaviour of married couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43*, 817-824.

Graham, T. (1994). *Gender, relationship, and target differences in empathic accuracy.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Texas at Arlington.

Green, A. (1975). The analyst, symbolisation and absence in the analytic setting: on changes in analytic practice and analytic experience. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 56*, 1-22.

Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11*, 255-274.

Griffin, D. W., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). The metaphysics of measurement: The case of adult attachment. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in Personal Relationships* (Vol. 5, pp. 17-52). London: Jessica Kingsley.

Grych, J. H., & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Marital conflict and children's adjustment: a cognitive-contextual framework. *Psychology Bulletin, 108*, 267-290.

Halford, W. K., & Bouma, R. (1997). Individual psychopathology and marital distress. In W. K. Halford & H. J. Markman (Eds.), *Clinical Handbook of Marriage and Couples Intervention* (pp. 291-321). London: Wiley.

Hammersley, M. (1996). The relationship between qualitative and quantitative research: paradigm loyalty versus methodological eclecticism. In J. T. E. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods for psychology and the social sciences*. Leicester: BPS Books.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511-524.

Holmes, J. (2001). Foreword. In C. Clulow (Ed.), *Adult Attachment and Couple Psychotherapy: The 'secure base' in practice and research* (pp. xii-xx). East Sussex: Brunner-Routledge.

Horowitz, L. M. (1979). On the cognitive structure of interpersonal problems treated in psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47*, 5-15.

Horowitz, L. M., Rosenberg, S. E., Baer, B. A., Ureno, G., & Villasenor, V. S. (1988). Inventory of interpersonal problems; Psychometric properties and clinical applications. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 885-892.

Hosokawa, T., & Ohyama, M. (1993). Reliability and validity of a Japanese version of the Short-Form Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised. *Psychological Reports, 72*, 823-832.

Ickes, W. (1993). Empathic Accuracy. *Journal of Personality, 61*, 587-609.

Ickes, W. (2003). *Everyday Mind Reading: Understanding what other people think and feel*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Ickes, W., & Simpson, J. (1997). Managing empathic accuracy in close relationships. In W. Ickes (Ed.), *Empathic Accuracy* (pp. 218-250). New York: Guilford.

Kierner, K. & Jacobson, N. S. (1994) Emotion and behavioural couple therapy. In S. M. Johnson & L. S. Greenberg (eds) *The Heart of the Matter: Perspectives on Emotion in Marital Therapy* (pp. 207-226). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Katz, Y. J., & Francis, L. J. (2000). Hebrew Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire: short form (EPQR-S) and abbreviated Form (EPQR-A). *Social Behaviour and Personality, 28*, 555-560.

Kelleher, J. (1998). *The effects of frames of reference on empathic accuracy.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Texas at Arlington.

Kellett, S., Beail, N., Newman, D., & Hawes, A. (2004). The Factor Structure of the Brief Symptom Inventory: Intellectual Disability Evidence. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 11*, 275-281.

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Glaser, R., Cacioppo, J. T., MacCullum, R. C., & Snydersmith, M. (1997). Marital conflict in older adults: endocrine and immunological correlates. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 59*, 339-349.

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Kennedy, S., Malkoff, S., Fisher, L., & Speicher, C. E. (1988). Marital discord and immunity in males. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 50*, 213-229.

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Malarkey, W. B., Chee, M., Newton, T., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1993). Negative behaviour during marital conflict is associated with immunological down-regulation. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 55*, 395-409.

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Newton, T., Cacioppo, J. T., MacCullum, R. C., & Glaser, R. (1996). Marital conflict and endocrine function: Are men really more physiologically affected than women? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 324-332.

Kilpatrick, S. D., Bissonnette, V. L., & Rusbult, C. E. (2002). Empathic accuracy and accommodative behaviour among newly married couples. *Personal Relationships, 9*, 369-393.

Klein, M. (1945). The Oedipus Complex in the light of early anxieties. In *The Writings of Melanie Klein* (pp. 370-419). London: Hogarth, 1975.

Kline, G. H., Baucom, B., Hartman, S., Gilbert, K., Gonzales, T., & Markman, H. J. (in press). The Interactional Dimensions Coding System: A global system for couple interactions. In P. Kerig & D. H. Baucom (Eds.), *Couple observational coding systems*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lecours, S., & Bouchard, M. A. (1997). Dimensions of Mentalisation: Outlining Levels of Psychic Transformation. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 78*, 855-875.

Lis, A., & Zennaro, A. (1997). A semi-structured interview with parents to be used during pregnancy: preliminary data. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 18*, 306-323.

Laplanche, J. & Pontalis, J-B. (1988) *The Language of Psychoanalysis* (trans. D. Nicholson-Smith). London: Karnac and the Institute of Psychoanalysis (original work published 1967).

Lis, A., Zennaro, A., & Mazzeschi, C. (2000). Application of the Reflective Self-Function Scale to the Clinical Interview for Couples During Pregnancy. *Psychological Reports, 87*, 901-918.

Luquet, P. (1987). Penser - Parlar: un apport psychanalytique a la theorie du langage. In R. Christie, et al. (Ed.), *La Parole Troublee* (pp. 161-300). Paris: Presses Univ. France.

Main, M., & Weston, D. R. (1982). Avoidance of the Attachment Figure in Infancy: Descriptions and Interpretations. In C. Parkes & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *The Place of Attachment in Human Behaviour*. New York: Basic Books.

Malarkey, W. B., Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Pearl, D., & Glaser, R. (1994). Hostile behaviour during conflict alters pituitary and adrenal hormones. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 56*, 41-51.

Marangoni, C., Garcia, S., Ickes, W., & Teng, G. (1995). Empathic accuracy in a clinically relevant setting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 854-869.

Margolin, G., Christensen, A., & John, R. S. (1996). The continuance and spillover of everyday tensions in distressed and nondistressed families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 10*, 304-321.

Marty, P. (1990). *La Psychosomatique de l'adulte*. Paris: Presses Univ. France.

Marty, P. (1991). *Mentalisation et Psychosomatique*. Paris: Laboratoire Delagrange.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1995). Emotional intelligence and the construction and regulation of feelings. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 4*, 197-208.

McCallum, M., & Piper, W. E. (1997). Integration of psychological mindedness and related concepts. In M. McCallum & W. E. Piper (Eds.), *Psychological mindedness: A contemporary understanding* (pp. 237-258). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McGonagle, K., Kessler, R., & Schilling, E. (1992). The frequency and determinants of marital disagreements in a community sample. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 9*(4), 507-524.

Murphy, C. M., & O'Farrell, T. J. (1994). Factors associated with marital aggression in male alcoholics. *Journal of Family Psychology, 8*, 321-335.

Noller, P. (1980). Misunderstandings in marital communication: A study of couples' nonverbal communication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 1135-1148.

Noller, P., & Ruzzene, M. (1991). Communication in marriage: The influence of affect and cognition. In G. J. O. Fletcher & F. D. Fincham (Eds.), *Cognition in close relationships* (pp. 203-233). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Noller, P., & Venardos, C. (1986). Communication awareness in married couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 3*, 31-42.

O'Farrell, T. J., Choquette, K. A., & Birchler, G. R. (1991). Sexual satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the marital relationships of male alcoholics seeking marital therapy. *Journal of Studies in Alcohol, 52*, 441-447.

O'Leary, K. D., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1994). Physical aggression in early marriage: pre-relationship and relationship effects. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62*, 594-602.

O'Leary, K. D., & Smith, D. A. (1991). Marital interactions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 42*, 191-212.

Orlinsky, D. E., & Howard, K. I. (1966). *Therapy Session Report, Form T.* Chicago: Institute for Juvenile Research.

Owen, M. T., & Cox, M. J. (1997). Marital conflict and the development of infant-parent attachment relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology, 11*, 152-164.

Perneger, T. V. (1998). What's wrong with Bonferroni adjustments. *BMJ, 316*(7139), 1236-1238.

Pistole, C. (1989). Attachment in adult romantic relationships: Style of conflict resolution and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 6*(4), 505-512.

Rholes, W. S., Simpson, J., & Grich, J. (1998). Attachment orientations, social support, and conflict resolution in close relationships. In J. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 166-188). New York: Guilford Press.

Rogers, C. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21*, 95-103.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*, 185-211.

Schmaling, K. B., & Sher, T. G. (1997). Physical health and relationships. In W. K. Halford & H. J. Markman (Eds.), *Clinical Handbook of Marriage and Couples Intervention* (pp. 323-345). London: Wiley.

Senecal, S., Murard, N., & Hess, U. (2003). Do you know what I feel? Partners' predictions and judgments of each other's emotional reactions to emotion-eliciting situations. *Sex Roles, 48*(1/2), 21-37.

Sharpley, C. F., & Rogers, J. H. (1984). Preliminary validation of the Abbreviated Spanier Dyadic Adjustment Scale: Some psychometric data regarding a

Pincus, L. (1960) (Ed) *Marriage: Studies in Emotional Conflict and Growth.* London: Institute of Marital Studies.

screening test of marital adjustment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 44*, 1045-1049.

Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2002). Attachment-related psychodynamics. *Attachment and Human Development, 4*, 133-161.

Shi, L. (2003). The association between adult attachment styles and conflict resolution in romantic relationships. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 31*(3), 143-157.

Shill, M. A., & Lumley, M. A. (2002). The psychological mindedness scale: Factor structure, convergent validity and gender in a non-psychiatric sample. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 75*, 131-150.

Sibley, C. G., & Liu, J. H. (2004). Short-term temporal stability and factor structure of the revised experiences in close relationships (ECR-R) measure of adult attachment. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*(4), 969-975.

Simpson, J., Ickes, W., & Grich, J. (1999). When accuracy hurts: Relations of anxious-ambivalent dating partners to a relationship-threatening situation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 754-769.

Simpson, J., Rholes, W. S., & Phillips, D. (1996). Conflict in close relationships: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(5), 899-914.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38*, 15-28.

Stinson, L., & Ickes, W. (1992). Empathic accuracy in the interactions of male friends versus male strangers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 787-797.

Stone, A. A., & Neale, J. M. (1984). New measure of daily coping: development and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 892-906.

Swensen, C. A., Eskew, R. W., & Kolhepp, K. A. (1981). Stage of family life cycle, ego development, and the marriage relationship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43*, 841-853.

Thomas, G., Fletcher, G. J. O., & Lange, C. (1997). On-line Empathic Accuracy in Marital Interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(4), 839-850.

Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine, 140,* 227-235.

Trudeau, K. J., & Reich, R. (1995). Correlates of Psychological Mindedness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*(5), 699-704.

Van den Broucke, S., Vandereycken, W., & Norre, J. (1997). *Eating Disorders and Marital Relationships*. London: Routledge.

Weiss, R. L., & Heyman, R. E. (1997). A clinical research overview of couple interactions. In W. K. Halford & H. J. Markman (Eds.), *Clinical Handbook of Marriage and Couples Intervention*. London: Wiley.

Wilson, D. J., & Doolabh, A. (1992). Reliability, factorial validity and equivalence of several forms of the Eysenck Personality Inventory/Questionnaire in Zimbabwe. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13*, 637-643.

Zennaro, A., & Ascari, M. (1995). Il colloquio con giovani coppie in attesa del primogenito. In A. Lis, P. Venuti & M. R. De Zordo (Eds.), *Il colloquio come strumento psicologico* (2nd ed., pp. 315-326). Firenze, Italy: Giunti Barbera.